

BZ

17-

Q

EX

79

59

Baptist Union Theological Seminary
LIBRARY.

Library No. 3137 Shelf No. 89

Presented by

Chicago, 1872

Class

Book

University of Chicago Library

GIVEN BY

Besides the main topic this book also treats of

Subject No.

On page

Subject No.

On page

2

PROCEEDINGS,

AT

A MEETING

OF THE

Guildford Protestant Association,
Guildford Protestant
Association. HELD AT

THE TOWN HALL, GUILDFORD,

ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 9TH, 1838,

FOR THE PURPOSE OF

A DISCUSSION

BETWEEN

A PRIEST OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

AND

TWO CLERGYMEN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

ON

PEACE AMONG CHRISTIANS.

London:

JAMES PAUL, 52, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

1839.

BX1779

G9

ADVERTISEMENT.

IN explanation of the following discussion it is only necessary to mention, that the REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN is a Priest of the Church of Rome, residing at Sutton Place, near Ripley, Surrey, and that the REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR and the REV. JAMES R. PAGE are Clergymen of the Church of England, both residing in London. The Reporter submitted the following account of the Proceedings to each of those gentlemen; and by means of their assistance he has been enabled to render it an accurate record of all that took place.

It is proper to add, (in order to explain one or two observations that occur,) that the Rev. Joseph Sidden read his address, having previously committed it to paper in order (it is presumed) to insure accuracy of expression.



PROCEEDINGS, &c.

THE MAYOR OF GUILDFORD, Joseph Haydon, Esq. (having taken the Chair)—Christian friends, I find that this is considered an adjourned meeting from our Anniversary; but as it will be inconvenient for me to give up my time to the whole of the business of this day, I wish to call upon Mr. Rainbow as my substitute.

It was then moved and seconded, and carried unanimously, that J. M. Rainbow Esq. be requested to take the Chair; whereupon—

Mr RAINBOW took the Chair accordingly.

At the desire of the Chairman—

THE REV. JAMES R. PAGE opened the meeting with prayer.

THE CHAIRMAN—Ladies and gentlemen, It may be in the recollection of many, who are present here to-day, that this meeting originated from an annual meeting of The Guildford Protestant Association. On that occasion there were many points discussed, which were disputed at the end of the meeting by the Rev. Mr. Sidden, and he expressed a wish (as it was understood by the committee of the Association,) that some day should be fixed, on which certain differences between the Church of Rome and the Church of England might be discussed. A correspondence has ensued between the Committee and that reverend gentleman, which (if it be absolutely necessary) I will

read to the meeting, but, having glanced at it, I think it will be sufficient to state the result of it. A letter was written by the Secretary of the Guildford Protestant Association, stating that the Committee were quite ready to enter into the views of Mr. Sidden in any way that he should propose, and that he was at liberty to choose his subject. A subsequent letter from Mr. Sidden stated that he quite acquiesced in the proposal of the Association, and that the subject on which he wished to treat was—Peace among Christians. I presume that the reverend gentleman has come here with that intention. He will, as a preliminary, address the meeting for such space as he may find convenient and as the meeting may approve. As far as I am concerned, occupying this position, I should be glad to be guided by the meeting and supported by the meeting, in every thing that it may be my duty to do. In this discussion—a discussion of those great questions, so dear to us all, of whatever name, of whatever profession—we should have simply in view the the glory of God and an earnest desire to propagate and promulgate truth; and therefore the spirit, which should characterise all such meetings, is that of abiding by a simple desire for God's glory and the declaration of truth. Should this be departed from, of course it will be necessary for me to interfere; should it not be departed from, I am quite sure we shall all go away from this meeting wiser and better. I call on the Rev. Mr. Sidden.

REV. JAMES R. PAGE.—Before Mr. Sidden rises, perhaps I may be allowed to state to the meeting the terms that have been made. The honorary secretary of the Guildford Protestant Association communicated to me Mr. Sidden's letters, and I was called upon in the absence of my reverend friend Mr. Seymour to make the terms; and I beg to state what they are.

“Arrangements of the meeting to be held at Guildford, on the 9th of October;—

"Mr. Sidden asks to speak from one to two hours, before either Mr. Seymour or Mr. Page. Granted, on the following conditions ;—

"First, that Mr. Sidden should speak to the point, with permission to choose his question ;

"Secondly, that Mr. Sidden bear in mind, that Mr. Seymour and Mr. Page are clergymen of the Church of England, and therefore pledged to defend the principles of that Church alone."

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—I will begin, my friends, by laying before you the origin of the business, in which we are engaged to-day.

I hold in my hand a Protestant tract, which was given to one of my Catholic congregation at Sutton Place, by the Rev. Mr. Vincent, an Anglo-Protestant clergyman. From this paper, so given, I proceed to read to you as follows ;—

"How is a sinner justified before God? The Church of Rome, neither in her principles nor in her practice nor by the mouths of her priests, gives a definite reply to this question. The Church of Rome shuts up the Bible. All the doctrines of the Church of Rome are merely delusions heaped upon delusions. If you ask a priest how you must be saved, he bids you do penance, pray to the Virgin, worship a wafer, count beads, repeat *Ave Marias* and *Credos*, confess to him and pay him, and many other lies that lure to eternal ruin."

By the same person this other Protestant tract was also given to one of my Catholic congregation in the neighbourhood of Sutton Place, from which I read to you a sentence or two ;—

"Peter in his epistle calls the Church of Rome *Babylon*, which John in the Revelation calls *the cage of every unclean bird*.

"In the Church of Rome, the priests, who profess to forgive sin, demand money from every person who confesses.

“The Church of Rome commands her functionaries to imprison and kill those, who perseveringly differ from her.”

Having discovered those Protestant tracts among my flock at Sutton Place, I thought it my duty to write the letter to Mr. Vincent, which was partly discussed at your last meeting on the fourteenth of August. I hold that letter in my hand, and I request the meeting to do me the favour (at least as many of them as have not yet read it) to read that letter; for it was not read at the last meeting, and it was by no means fully discussed. I delivered to Mr. Vincent a copy of my letter on Good Friday last. On Easter eve I received from him a letter, in which he says—“Having always and on all occasions spoken of you with studied respect, and that too even while protesting against the unhappy errors of your faith, I rather wonder at the tone of acrimony in which you write.” I immediately wrote to Mr. Vincent the following lines—“Dear Sir, The whole scope of my letter, so far as you personally are concerned, is thus expressed at the end of it, ‘Earnestly wishing to be your humble servant in Jesus Christ.’” For the present I will merely repeat this wish, as I do most heartily feel it.

I heard no more from Mr. Vincent, and he heard no further from me.

A day or two before our last meeting, I met by chance with the following notice, issued by the Guildford Protestant Association; a portion of that notice I read to you;—

“At the particular request of the Committee, the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour, (late Secretary to the British Reformation Society,) and the Rev. James R. Page, (late honorary Secretary to the Protestant Association,) have kindly consented to address the meeting, when the letter, addressed to the Rev. Frederick Vincent (at Sutton Place) relative to his ‘No Popery’ campaign and to the Guildford Protestant Association

by the Rev. Joseph Sidden a Roman Catholic priest, will be fully discussed."

Having accidentally met with this notice a day or two before the meeting, I thought it my duty to attend here on the day of meeting. My object in attending was to obtain a clearer notion of the impediments brought forward against the Catholic religion in this neighbourhood, and to draw the attention of my neighbours towards my efforts to remove those impediments in the way of true christian peace. My proposition, at that meeting on the fourteenth of August, was an invitation to all present and to their neighbours to afford me opportunities, either in private or in public, of explaining to them the Catholic religion, and attempting (with God's blessing) to remove their dislike to it.

On the 31st. of August (as it bears date) the secretary of the Guildford Protestant Association wrote to me the letter, which I hold in my hand;—

"Reverend Sir, The committee of the Guildford Protestant Association have directed me to request, that you will carry into effect the proposition you made at the public meeting of the Society on the fourteenth instant to meet the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour and the Rev. James R. Page, for the purpose of entering on the discussion mentioned at such meeting."

The letter proceeded, proposing the fourth of October for the meeting. I answered the secretary, as follows;—

"Sir, The day which you mention will suit me. I think it is the will of God, that I should comply with this request of the Guildford Protestant Association. My offer, however, was not exactly that, which from the terms of your letter the Committee appear to suppose. Of course I shall be allowed from one to two hours, if convenient to me, to address the meeting before the reverend orators whom you name. All who recollect the proceedings of the fourteenth of August will readily perceive the justice of this arrangement. Pray have the goodness to send me a letter as soon as

possible, that I may not have the least doubt on this matter. I beg of God to bless you, and all for whom you write."

On the twelfth of September, the secretary wrote to me thus;—

"On behalf of the Guildford Protestant Association, I am desired to state to you, that no restriction will be imposed on you, as to the length of time it may be your pleasure to occupy in addressing the meeting on the fourth of October, and that the wish you express to speak first is willingly acceded to by the Association; but in order that the day may not be wasted by a diffuse and irregular discussion, I shall be obliged by your informing me what particular point you intend to introduce and speak upon. Shall it be a defence of your own Church? or a course of argument against the principles of the Protestant Church? Any other mode of condensing the matter to be discussed, to some fixed standard or text, will no doubt meet with the approbation of the Association."

To this letter I replied;—

"Sir, In reply to your favour of this morning, I answer that *Peace among christians* is the particular point which I shall introduce; and I will treat the subject in a manner, in which I have not hitherto known it to be treated, and which I think will be pleasing and profitable. I also propose endeavouring, in few words, to remove some impediments to this peace, which were brought forward at the meeting of the fourteenth of August."

On the 21st. of September the secretary wrote to me, proposing, that, as the Revising Baristers would have the use of this Hall on the fourth of October, the meeting should be held on the ninth; and I answered the secretary —

"I foresee nothing to make the 9th. of October an unsuitable day to me, and I shall be very glad to begin the performance of my offer to my neighbours, whether the reverend orators from London can attend

or not. Their presence has no necessary connection with my proposition made to the meeting on the 14th. of August."

A day or two afterwards I received a notice, enclosed to me, which I suppose most of you have seen ;

"A special meeting of the Guildford Protestant Association will be held in the Town Hall on Tuesday the ninth of October, when, the Rev. Joseph Sidden (Roman Catholic Priest) of Sutton Park having proposed and agreed to meet (accompanied by any Roman Catholic friends he may please to bring with him) the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour and the Rev. James R. Page, for the purpose of entering upon an important discussion, it is presumed the meeting will be deeply interesting and instructive to both Protestants and Catholics."

With respect to what my proposition was on the fourteenth of August, I have stated it. With regard to my being accompanied by any Roman Catholic friends, that I might please to bring with me, I beg to say that Roman Catholic clergymen are unfortunately very scarce in this country, and very much overloaded with missionary duties, so that many of them have under their charge a much greater number of people than the whole population of Guildford ; and I should therefore have been ashamed to request of any of my reverend brethren, to desert their immediate duty to aid me on an occasion of this kind, however unequal I may be to the performance of what I so earnestly desire. I recollect mentioning, at the meeting of the fourteenth of August, that I had no one to consult but Almighty God ; and I have adhered to that, which then appeared to me to be a just observation.

What I am now about to read to you has a *general* tendency to remove the impediments to peace, which were brought forward at the meeting of the fourteenth of August.

First, The whole and only matter of Catholic doctrinal belief is God's word, revealed by Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost to St. "Peter and the apostles" eighteen hundred years ago, and by them with God's command and assistance preached unerringly to mankind. It is called in English *the Gospel or the Faith*.

Secondly, This same gospel has ever since been, is now, and will be till the world's end, with God's authority and assistance, preached unerringly to mankind, by the great body of the Bishops succeeding the apostles, united with the Bishop, successor of St. Peter, who is by divine appointment chief Pastor of Christ's church and centre of union among christians on earth.

Thirdly, This body of Bishops now consists of about eight hundred men, dispersed over the world. St. Peter's successor now living is Gregory the Sixteenth, now Bishop of Rome, called commonly the Pope—or Father of the faithful on earth, for *Pope* signifies *Father*.

Fourthly, The rule of Church discipline among Catholics is, that each person be guided in that matter by the authority of the legitimate Bishop, to whom he is immediately subject.

The Church received the gospel (or whole body of divine doctrines) from Christ.

"I believe in Christ's Church"—may be supposed to have been at first the only requisite symbol of faith. As soon as any article of the faith was dangerously contradicted by any member of the Church, it became proper to add the expression of that article to the symbol. Who now become schismatical and heretical? those who add this expression, or those whose opposition made this addition advisable? The latter, to be sure, if they continue obstinate, since they now by their own act differ from those with whom they once agreed, and since they do not believe in Christ's Church, such as it was when they began to differ from it. Are *they* the Church, who have just changed their

belief? or those who go on believing as before? There was a time, when all who now differ in religion from the Roman Catholic Church (or at least those who at first held the peculiar opinions of all who now differ from it,) were agreed with it on the points, in which difference now exists. At the times of general agreement on these points, no symbol of belief of them was necessary; but as soon as open contradiction arose and spread, a declaration of the matter previously agreed upon became advisable for the preservation of truth. For all doctrine of the Church, universally agreed in as christian doctrine, must be *really* christian doctrine (or truth); otherwise the Church would not be holy—Christ and the Spirit of truth would not be with it and in it.

“I believe in the holy catholic Church.” These words signify—First, I believe that Christ’s Church is necessarily *catholic*, by its duration and diffusion; secondly, I believe that Christ’s Church, always catholic, is always necessarily *holy*—“sanctified in the truth, which is God’s word,” says Jesus Christ in the seventeenth chapter of St. John’s gospel; it is always holy, that is, it never requires the belief of any article not received by it from Christ, and always separates from its communion (“marks and avoids”) the members who become dangerous obstinate contradicators of any article that it received from its founder.

The last general assembly of the Bishops of the catholic Church throughout the world is called *the Council of Trent*, because they met at the city of Trent to the north of Italy. Three English Bishops assisted at the later sessions of the Council—Dr. Scott, Bishop of Chester, Dr. Pate, Bishop of Worcester, and Dr. Goldwell, Bishop of St. Asaph: Cardinal Pole also, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, presided at one of the earlier sessions of the council of Trent, as Legate of his holiness the Pope. This Council continued at intervals for eighteen years—from 1545 to 1563. The object of the Bishops in assembling was, as they de-

clare in their decree for beginning the Council—"It pleases us to decree and declare, that the holy and general Tridentine Council begins and is begun for the praise and glory of the holy and undivided Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost—for the propagation and exaltation of the faith and the christian religion—for the extirpation of heresies—for the peace and union of the Church—for the reformation of the christian clergy and people—for the depression and extinction of the enemies of the christian name." For the propagation of the faith received from Christ, they solemnly expressed that symbol of faith usually called the *Nicene Creed*; and they made twelve decrees or declarations of the doctrine of Christ and the Holy Spirit regarding points, which the Church from the beginning had hitherto taught in peace, but which then began to meet with contradiction from innovators—1. A decree on the canonical scriptures—2. On original sin—3. On justification—4. On sacraments in general, and on baptism and confirmation—5. On the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist—6. On the holy sacrament of penance, and on extreme unction or the last anointing—7. On communion under one species; and the communion of infants—8. On the sacrifice of the mass—9. On the institution of the priesthood of the new law—10. On the sacrament of matrimony—11. On purgatory, on the invocation, veneration and relics of saints, and on holy images—12. On indulgences. For the extirpation of heresies, they made a hundred and thirty five formal canons, or declarations condemnatory of erroneous doctrines; (such is the meaning of the word *canon*.) For the reformation of the christian clergy and people, they made twenty one decrees, some of the heads of which I will read to you.

But first let me observe, in the words of the learned Bishop Milner, formerly catholic Bishop of the Midland District of England, (*End of Religious Controversy*, Letter 11th.)—

"When any fresh controversy arises in the Church,

the fundamental maxim of the Bishops and Popes, to whom it belongs to decide upon it, is not to consult their own private opinion or interpretation of Scripture, but to enquire *what is and has ever been the doctrine of the Church* concerning it. Hence their cry is, and ever has been, on such occasions, as well in Council as out of it 'So we have received,' 'So the universal Church believes,' 'Let there be no new doctrine, none but what has been delivered down to us by tradition.' The tradition of which we now treat is not a local, but a universal tradition, as widely spread as the Catholic Church itself is, and every where found the same. In the present case" (of the differences between Protestants and Catholics), "they are not the Catholics alone of different ages and nations, who vouch for the traditions in question, (I mean those rejected by Protestants,) but all the subsisting heretics and schismatics of former ages, without exception. The Nestorians and Eutychians, for example, deserted the Catholic Church in defence of opposite errors fourteen hundred years ago, and still form regular churches under Bishops and Patriarchs throughout the East; in like manner, the Greek schismatics, properly so called, broke off from the Latin church for the last time in the eleventh century. Theirs is well known to be the prevailing religion of christians throughout the Turkish and¹ Russian empires. Nevertheless these and all the other christian sectaries of ancient date, in every article in dispute between Catholics and Protestants (except that concerning the Pope's supremacy,) agree with the former and condemn the latter. Let those, therefore, who declaim against the alleged ignorance and vices of the Catholic clergy and laity during the five or six ages preceding the reformation, and pretend to show how the tenets which they object to might have been introduced into *our* church, explain how precisely the same could have been quietly received by the Nestorians at Bagdad, the Eutychians at Alexandria, and the

Russian Grecks at Moscow! All these, and particularly the last named, were ever ready to find fault with us upon subjects of comparatively small consequence, and yet, so far from objecting to the pretended novelties of prayers for the dead, addresses to the saints, the mass, the real presence &c., they have always professed, and continue to profess these doctrines and practices as zealously as we do."

I will now tell you some of the heads of the decrees, made by the Catholic Bishops at Trent for the reformation of clergy and people:—

A decree on the impression (the printing, that is), the exposition and legitimate use of holy scripture. A decree on those things, which relate to the reformation of the whole body of the clergy—who, what sort of persons, and how they are to be assumed to the episcopacy, and within what time consecrated. A decree on the residence and honourable living of the Bishops. A decree on plurality of benefices, prohibited to Bishops. A decree on the office of a Bishop in preaching. A decree on the duty of a Bishop in ordaining. A decree on the duty, right and authority of a Bishop in visiting. A decree on who and what sort of persons are to be created parish priests. A decree on the residence of parish priests. A decree on plurality of benefices, prohibited when those benefices have the care of souls annexed to them. A decree on the union of benefices whether with the care of souls or without, with such as have the care of souls; or the union of two or more benefices without the care of souls in one holder. A decree on the duty of parish priests in preaching and administering the sacraments. A decree upon who and what sort of persons are to be raised to the dignities and canons in cathedral churches and collegiate churches. A decree on the residence of Canons or prebendaries at their Cathedral church. A decree on the duty and on the morals of the canons. A decree on recalling the life of the religious (the monks and nuns) to mo-

nastic discipline. A decree on the faithful administration of hospitals. A decree on examining persons who are presented for ordination, and on the time and place of ordaining. A decree on instructing the clergy in theology, and on the discipline conducive to their education, and on erecting Seminaries. A decree on putting an end to the practice of duelling.

Such are some of the decrees, reformatory of clergy and people, which were made at the general Council of Trent; and if those decrees had happily been adopted in this country, as they were adopted in Catholic countries, the time of our legislature would not now be wasted in regulating matters, which were long ago regulated and settled by the Catholic Bishops at the Council of Trent, and they would have prevented many evils, that are now complained of in this country and that cause so much animosity among the people.

I now come to one impediment to peace, in particular, which was brought forward at the meeting on the fourteenth of August. Of the 135 canons, made by the Council of Trent, there is not one, that forbids the reading of the holy scripture, either in the original languages or in translations into modern tongues. At our last meeting, it was asserted, that there was such a canon.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—No, no.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—It appears now admitted that there is not.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—No, it was never asserted by me to be in the canons. It is in the rules of the Index by the Fathers at the Council of Trent.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—In the doctrinal decree on the canonical Scriptures, the Council speaks thus;

“The sacred and œcumenical Tridentine Synod, legitimately assembled in the Holy Ghost, (the three Legates of the apostolic See presiding in it,) receives and venerates with an equal feeling of piety all the books as well of the Old as of the New Testament, since

one God is the author of both, and likewise the traditions themselves, both those relating to faith and those relating to morals, as being dictated either by Christ in word of mouth or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved by continuous succession in the Catholic Church. Let all, therefore, understand what testimonies and safeguards the Synod will chiefly use in confirming dogmas and settling morals."

The Council then makes regulations for the scriptures being edited and printed correctly, and regulations for checking all irreverent profanation of the words and sentences of scripture.

Again; in the reformatory decree "for instituting Lectures on Scripture, and on the Liberal Arts," ("that scripture may not be neglected," says the Council,) the Council, speaking of holy Scripture, calls it "that heavenly treasure of sacred books, which the Holy Ghost with the highest liberality hath delivered to men." That is the description, which the Council gives of holy scripture. The Council then decree that it be read and duly interpreted in all places of religious instruction, which it enumerates; requiring Bishops to enforce this regulation by penalties. And in the fifth reformatory decree, the Council commands "that bishops and parish priests or their duly appointed deputies announce the sacred scripture—"

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—I beg pardon; the reverend gentleman has stated, that the Council of Trent made regulations to prevent the abuse and profanation of the scripture; will he be so good as to state in what part of the proceedings of the Council of Trent we shall find it, that we may refer to it?

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—Will the gentleman allow me first to conclude what I am at present engaged on? I mention, as I go on, the number of the decree; I do not mention the page in the book, because the editions may be differently paged.

In the fifth reformatory decree (chapter the fourth),

the Council of Trent commands, "that bishops and parish priests or their duly appointed deputies announce the sacred scriptures and the divine law at least on all Sundays and solemn festival days, but in the times of the fasts of Lent and the Advent of our Lord *every* day, or at least three days in the week, if the Bishops shall think it necessary; and besides, as often as they shall judge it can seasonably be done; and let the Bishop diligently admonish the people, that each one is bound to be present, whenever it can be done conveniently, at his parish church to hear the word of God. The same also will take care, that at least on all Sundays and other festival days, in the several parishes, the children be taught the rudiments of the faith, and obedience towards God and their parents, by those on whom it shall be incumbent. And if it be necessary, they (the Bishops) shall compel by ecclesiastical censure."

The Council of Trent *never* pretended to delegate its authority, as a general Council; nor *could* it. Even with regard to Parliamentary Committees, (which were mentioned at our last meeting,) I believe their acts are not law, till they have been reported and have become acts of Parliament also. The Council of Trent did not depute any persons whatever to make regulations about reading the Catholic versions of scripture in the vulgar tongue. Certain fathers, commissioned by the Council for *other* purposes specified in the eighteenth and twenty-fifth Sessions, *did* make a regulation of this sort, which was approved by Pope Pius the Fourth in the year 1654, after the Council had dissolved itself in 1653. The Council had never received the report of these Commissioners, as may be seen in Session 25.

The ten rules of the Index (as it is called) are bound up at the end of *some* editions of the canons and decrees of the Council; but they are never represented by the Editors as any part of the proceedings of the Council; on the contrary, they are placed in the

appendix of the book under a distinct title, and in the preface the Editor expressly mentions his intention of *annexing* them and many other additional articles *after the conclusion* of the proceedings of the Council. That completely settles a point, which made some little obstruction in the proceedings of the last meeting.

The fourth rule of the Index (as it is called) after all does not prevent the reading of the scriptures in the vulgar tongue; it only regulates this reading, and there are some Protestants as well as some Catholics, who do not think it imprudent to regulate such a matter. Prudent or imprudent, however, rule the fourth is not a rule now. It was removed by the congregation of the Index by a decree on the 13th of June 1757; and in 1769 and 1779 the New and Old Testaments were translated into Italian by the learned Martini, Archbishop of Florence, and recommended to the use of the faithful by Pope Pius the Sixth, in an honorary brief often prefixed to our English Bibles. The fourth rule of the Index never had been adopted by the whole church at large; it was enforced in some dioceses—never in England, nor in France, nor in many other parts. Even if it had been among the reformatory decrees of the Council of Trent, it could but have been a point of *discipline*, and therefore not obligatory until adopted by Primatial, Provincial, or Diocesan authority, and then obligatory only upon the people subject to that authority. But it was *not* Tridentine.

I hold in my hand an English translation of the new testament, stereotyped of a pocket size on purpose that English and Irish Catholics and Scotch Catholics may have the comfort of carrying the word of God, the holy scripture, with them in their pockets. It is approved by the Catholic Bishops of Ireland. The approbation of the Bishop of Down and Connor is specially prefixed to it. I am not, however, about to read to you that article; but I am about to read to you another thing, which is prefixed to it, and which is of great authority of course. "The following letter

from Pope Pius the Sixth, addressed to the most Rev. Anthony Martini, Archbishop of Florence, shows the benefit, which the faithful may reap from their having the scriptures in their vulgar tongue"—say the Irish Catholic Bishops ;

"Pope Pius the Sixth. Beloved son, health and apostolical benediction! At a time when a vast number of bad books, which grossly attack the Catholic religion, are circulated among the unlearned, to the extreme destruction of souls, you judge exceedingly well that *the faithful should be excited to the reading of the holy scriptures* ; for these are the most abundant sources, which *ought to be left open to every one*, to draw from them purity of morals and of doctrine, to eradicate the errors which are so widely disseminated in these corrupt times. This you have seasonably effected, as you declare, by publishing the sacred writings in the language of your country, *suitable to every one's capacity*, especially when you show and set forth that you have added explanatory notes, which being extracted from the holy fathers preclude every possible danger of abuse. Thus you have not swerved, either from the laws of the Congregation of the Index or from the constitution of Benedict XIV., that immortal Pope, our predecessor in the Pontificate, and formerly (when we held a place near his person) our excellent master in ecclesiastical learning—circumstances which we mention as honourable to us. We therefore applaud your eminent learning, joined with your extraordinary piety ; and we return you our due acknowledgment for the books, which you have transmitted to us, and which when convenient we will read over. In the meantime as a token of our Pontifical benevolence, receive our apostolical benediction, which to you, beloved son, we very affectionately impart. Given at Rome, on the calends of April, 1778, the fourth year of our Pontificate. (A translation from the Latin original)."

I hold in my hand "Pastoral Instructions," by the

Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops in Ireland, to the clergy and laity of their communion throughout Ireland; it contains also a copy of the encyclical Letter of Pope Leo the Twelfth. The Irish Bishops, speaking of this letter, say—"Our holy father recommends to the observance of the faithful a rule of the Congregation of the Index, which prohibits the perusal of the sacred scriptures in the vulgar tongue, without the sanction of the competent authorities. His holiness wisely remarks, "that more evil than good results from the indiscriminate perusal of them, on account of the malice or infirmity of men." In this sentiment of our Head we fully concur; and a sad experience of its justice is found in the excesses and conflicting errors of those sects, among whom such perusal is unrestrained. With us it is not so"—(that is, no inconvenience is found, from our permitting the holy scriptures in the vulgar tongue to be freely used by our people;)"—"and approved versions of the holy scriptures, with notes explanatory of the text, are read by many of you with edification and advantage." Now take notice how the Irish Bishops continue;

"We rejoice, dearly beloved, that the word of God should dwell abundantly with you. It is 'useful to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice'; and when read with piety and devotion, especially in families and at the time of prayer, it assists the man of God, whose heart is humble, and whose understanding is obedient to Christ in his holy Church, to 'become perfect, and to be furnished unto every good work.' But as heresies have arisen, and perverse doctrines, ensnaring souls and precipitating them into the abyss, have been broached only when the good scriptures have been badly understood, and when that which was badly understood was rashly and boldly asserted, it is necessary that such passages as are hard to be understood, and which 'the ignorant and unsettled daily wrest to their own destruction,' (as St. Peter declares

in the holy scripture in his epistle)—it is necessary that such passages be received in that sense, which the Church of God has assigned to them, and which is the same that she has been taught by the Holy Ghost. In reading, therefore, the sacred scripture, dearly beloved, seek only to become ‘wise unto salvation’; and avoid that most pernicious of all errors, that source of numberless evils—that pride and presumption, which has desolated the Church, and which would tempt you to set up your own weak and fallible judgment against the judgment of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church, which is (as the apostle terms it) ‘a pillar and ground of truth,’ illuminated by the Holy Spirit and directed and governed in all her decisions by the Son of God. As to the books, which are distributed by the Bible Society, under the name of Bibles or Testaments or Tracts or whatever name may be given to them, as they treat of religion and are not sanctioned by us or by any competent authority in the Catholic Church, the use, the perusal, the reading or retaining of them is entirely and without any exception prohibited to you. To enter into their merits or demerits is foreign to our purpose; such of them as have come under our observation are replete with errors; many of them are heretical, and generally they abound in calumnies and misrepresentations against our holy religion. As such they are to be avoided; and should any of them happen to be in your possession, they are to be restored to the persons who may have given them to you, or otherwise to be destroyed—except only bibles or testaments, which, if not returned to the donors, are to be deposited with the parish priest.”

You will observe, that the Irish Catholic people have full authority to make use of translations of holy scripture, in their own tongue. The right, therefore, of using holy scripture is in the hands of Irish Catholics; and not only the right, but the fact of their using them exists. The *right* and the *fact* are with us.

If some Catholics have held the opinion that a prudent restraint was desirable, so have some Protestants. The Protestant Archbishop Bramhall of Armagh says—"The unrestricted liberty of reading the bible is more injurious to religion, than all the restraints of the Catholics." The Protestant Bishop Hare (of Chichester) also speaks to the same effect. Likewise another Protestant clergyman, the author of "A Proposal for a Catholic communion," says—

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—Name, name.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—I do not know his name; he appears to have been an archdeacon of the Church of England in the reign of Queen Anne; his work is on sale at Booker's.

THE CHAIRMAN.—Can you name the place, of which he was archdeacon?

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—No; but I give these as the words of a Protestant clergyman.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—You do not know that he was a Protestant at all.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—I have put the work into the hands of a Protestant clergyman, who agrees with it; and it agrees with Archbishop Bramhall; I have often tried to discover who was the author.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—It was written perhaps by a Roman Catholic priest.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—I think not, because the Hon. and Rev. Arthur Perceval, Rector of East Horsley, borrowed the book of me, and he wrote to me that he so much approved of it that he meant to procure a copy of it. I do not know who wrote it; I wish merely to read these words from it—"The fourth rule of the Index seems modestly composed, to restrain those only from reading the bible, whom they see so self-conceited or so rash as to be in danger of 'wresting it to their own destruction.'"

The very learned Protestants, Selden, Hooker, Archdeacon Cambridge, and the *British Critic* all speak the same sentiments with the Protestant Arch-

bishop of Armagh. I have just read to you what he says; the Council of Trent never said that, or any thing similar. It places no restraint on men in this matter.

Again, then, I proclaim in this room, that Catholics are as much at liberty to read the bible as Protestants. The due use of the bible the Catholic Church desires; and the abuse of it she deprecates. I look upon the holy scriptures myself to be one of the many means of grace, given by God to his Church; and of course I desire to see this, as well as all the other means of grace, duly and profitably employed; and of course I also grieve, when I see this, or any other of the means of grace, misapplied or perverted. I grieved, when I read in the public papers the other day of the followers of Joanna Southcote parading the streets of London, with passages of the bible engraved upon the banners in their procession. I grieved also, when I read, a few months ago, of the famous Courtenay reading and misinterpreting the holy scriptures to his followers in the neighbouring county of Kent; and of the New Testament found in his pocket on searching him when he was taken. But such subjects of grief have been of so frequent occurrence even in my lifetime, that I will not detain you with the recital. Perhaps those, who seek to withhold the bible from such persons as they think would misinterpret it, wish to act on the admonition of our Lord—(Matt. 7. 6.) “Give not that which is holy to dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest perhaps they trample them under their feet. and turning again they rend you.” But whatever principle *they* act upon, the holy Catholic Church does not wish to withhold the bible from any to whom it would be useful; and her present discipline is to allow its indiscriminate use by all. We must never lose sight of the distinction between the due use and the abuse of the blessings of God: blessings abused have the effect of curses. Our Lord, who said, “He that eateth me

shall live by me" (in the sixth chapter of the gospel of St. John), said also, "He that eateth unworthily eateth judgment to himself." If you ask me what I mean by *a due use* of scripture, perhaps I may answer that to use the holy scripture duly is to read or hear, under suitable circumstances and with a good motive, the very words penned by the inspired writer, and to understand them in the very same sense that was intended by the Spirit of God—or to imbibe the same divine sense from words of any other language, duly adapted to convey it.

Before abandoning this subject, I must observe that a passage from the *Catholic Magazine*, which I quoted in my Letter to Mr. Vincent, was not clearly worded. It might appear to say, that the fourth rule of the Index was every where adopted in the Catholic Church.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—It *did* say that.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—This would be quite contrary to the fact. It was but partially adopted at any time, and was (as I before said) removed more than eighty years ago altogether. In copying the passage my attention was fixed chiefly on the words which I printed in Italics.

If any one would know what "a multitude of translations of holy scripture were put forth by Catholic divines, before such a thing as a Protestant bible was ever heard of," particularly in the south of Europe, let him consult a work entitled *The Sacred Library* (Bibliotheca Sacra), published by the profoundly learned Professor Le Long in the last century; Mr. Hørne, a Protestant clergyman and writer now living, calls the Paris edition "the best edition of a most laborious work." I can also with great confidence refer you to an article in the *Dublin Review* for July 1836, page 367; it is headed "Versions of Scripture," and has been read by many with the greatest pleasure and improvement.

Again, referring to my letter, if any one would know

how true it is that "no country ever became Protestant by reading the bible," I would recommend him to read another article in the *Dublin Review*, (the number for October 1837, page 428,) headed "The bible and the reformation." One of the principal conductors of the *Dublin Review* is the very reverend and very learned Dr. Wiseman, of the University of Rome, whose literary character is known throughout Europe and America.

Another impediment to peace, brought forward at our last meeting, was a canon or rule, (a condemnatory rule,) on the subject of justification—a canon of the Council of Trent, made at the Session on the thirteenth of January 1547. The words of the canon which were read at our last meeting, are these (as I have translated them from the original):—

"If any one shall say, that justice received is not preserved, and also increased before God, through good works, but that these works are only the fruits and the signs of the justification received, but not the cause of increasing it, let him be anathema;" that is, let him be an excommunicated person—for such is the meaning of the word *anathema*.

In order to understand this canon on the subject of justification, which was brought forward at our last meeting as an impediment to peace, I will read to you from the decree of the Council of Trent on justification.

The preamble of the decree—"Since at this time a certain erroneous doctrine about justification has been disseminated, not without the loss of many souls and the great detriment of ecclesiastical unity; for the praise and glory of Almighty God, the peace of the Church and the salvation of souls, the sacred œcumenical and general Tridentine Synod, assembled legitimately in the Holy Ghost, the Legates of the Pope presiding, intends to expound to all the faithful in Christ the true and sound doctrine of that very

justification, which the Son of God, Christ Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith, taught, the apostles delivered, and the Catholic Church by the suggestion of the Holy Ghost hath perpetually retained, distinctly forbidding that henceforth any one presume to believe, to preach, or to teach, otherwise than is settled and declared by the said decree."

In Chapter 10, entitled, "On the increase of justification received," the words of the Council are these—"They, therefore, who are thus justified, and made the friends and domestics of God, going from virtue to virtue (Psalm 83. 8.), are, as the apostle says (2 Corinthians, chap. 4. 16.), renewed day by day; that is, by mortifying the members of their flesh (Colossians, chap. 3. 5.), and employing those instruments of justice unto sanctification (Romans, c. 6. 13, 19.), by the observance of the commandments of God and the Church, faith co-operating with their good works, they increase in justice itself received through Christ's grace, and are more justified; as it is written (Apocalypse, chap. 22), He that is just, let him be justified still—and again (Ecclesiasticus, chap. 18, ver. 22), Be not afraid to be justified even to death—and again, Do ye see, (says the Scripture,) do ye see, that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only" (James, chap. 2, verse 24.)

But this increase of justice the Church asks for (on the thirteenth Sunday after Pentecost,) when she prays, "Give us, O Lord, an increase of faith, hope and charity;" the Catholic Church throughout the world prays in those words on that day. And you, my friends, pray in the very same words, on the fourteenth Sunday after Trinity; for this is the collect for that day, which I copied from your Book of Common Prayer—"Give unto us the increase of faith, hope and charity, and, that we may obtain that which thou dost promise, make us to love that which thou dost command." Again, in your collect on the twenty-fifth Sunday after Trinity, you pray—"Stir

up, we beseech thee, O Lord, the wills of thy faithful people, that they, plenteously bringing forth the fruit of good works, may of thee be plenteously rewarded." These prayers are beautiful prayers, which have been copied into your Prayer-book from our Mass-book.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—No.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—I can show you them in the Mass-book.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—We have taken them from the same source that you copied from.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—I can show them in Mass-books, I believe, more than a thousand years old.

On the seventh Sunday after Trinity, you pray in these words—"Increase in us true religion." On the fourth Sunday after Trinity, you pray—"Increase and multiply upon us thy mercy." Besides, I may observe, in general, either the prayer of the just man brings through Christ an increase of justice, or why should a just man pray?—

I now go on with the words of the Council of Trent—"After this Catholic doctrine of justification, which unless a man shall faithfully and firmly receive he cannot be justified, it hath pleased the holy Synod to subjoin these canons, that all men may know, not only what they ought to hold and follow, but also what to avoid and fly from."

There are sixteen chapters on justification, and thirty-three Canons. The twenty-fourth is that objected to at your last meeting. I have just read it. The thirty-third and last is as follows, and with it I conclude this point which was introduced at our last meeting—"If any one shall say, that by this Catholic doctrine of justification, expressed by the Holy Synod in this present decree, any derogation is made from the glory of God or the merits of Jesus Christ our Lord, and not rather that the truth of our faith, and in fine the glory of God and of Jesus Christ are illustrated, let him be anathema;" (let him be an excommunicated person.)

At our last meeting were brought forward many impediments to peace, connected with the devotion of certain Catholics towards the blessed Virgin Mary and the other saints in heaven. All that the Catholic Church requires men to believe, about invoking the blessed Virgin Mary and the other saints in heaven, is contained in these words of the Council of Trent, Session the twenty-fifth;—

“The holy synod commands all Bishops, &c., that, according to the practice of the Catholic and Apostolic Church received from the earliest times of the christian religion, and the confessions of the holy fathers and the decrees of the holy councils, they diligently instruct the faithful,” &c., “teaching them that the saints, reigning together with Christ, offer their prayers to God for men, that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to fly to their prayers, regard and help, for benefits to be obtained from God through his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who alone is our Redeemer and Saviour.”

This is all the article of faith on this point. Believe this; and so far you are admissible to the communion of the Church throughout the world. There is not a word of this inconsistent with my “first defence” of the Catholic Church against the Guildford Protestant Association, which I circulated in this town and neighbourhood last year.

That this was the doctrine of Christ and the apostles is also a historical fact, which I am ready to prove, whenever convenient to you, by testimonies unexceptionable both to Protestants and Catholics, as well as to all who know what testimony is. I cannot refrain from observing here, with the great Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux—“We believe that the blessed Virgin and the saints *pray*; therefore we believe them to be infinitely below Him, who hears their prayers and gives; they pray through Jesus Christ—therefore they are infinitely below Him, who is heard through himself.” As to the expression “reigning with

Christ," which is used by the Council, it is strictly scriptural, being borrowed from Revelation, chap. 2, verse 26, where we read—"He that shall overcome and keep my works unto the end, I will give him power over the nations and he shall rule them with a rod of iron;" and chap. 3, verse 21—"To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame and am sat down with my Father in his throne." Oh! my friends, how sublime is the destiny that awaits the good in eternity! And again, chap. 20 of the Apocalypse or Revelation, verse 6—"They shall reign with Christ."

The words, quoted by Messrs Seymour and Page at our last meeting, as an impediment to christian peace, from the encyclical letter of his holiness Gregory the Sixteenth, the present Pope, merely express an opinion, in which no one is obliged to concur. The very words of the Pope are only a quotation from a sermon of St. Bernard's. As to St. Bernard, perhaps you already know, that, in the judgment of Protestants and Catholics, he was the most illustrious character in Europe in the twelfth century. Learning, virtue, holiness and the fruits of holiness were gifts of God, which caused him to be the ornament of his age; chosen by kings and emperors to decide their differences. The Protestant Bishop Morton of Durham says of St. Bernard—"Bernard shone forth with the light, as well of his example, as of his learning;" and another Protestant Bishop, Bishop Charlton, writes of St. Bernard—"I would to God we had at this day many, nay but one such, as it is manifest Bernard was." Martin Luther acknowledged the wonderful miracles, that God wrought by St. Bernard. It is from a sermon of his, that the Pope quotes the words objected to at our last meeting. As St. Alphonsus tells us, in his "Way of Salvation"—"St. Bernard, St. Bonaventure, St. Bernardin, St. Germanus, St. Antoninus Archbishop of Florence, and others were of opinion, that it is the will of God to dispense

through the hands of Mary whatever grace he is pleased to bestow upon us, as purchased by Jesus Christ." That is not a doctrine of the Catholic Church; quite the contrary; it is an "opinion" of certain persons, whom I have just named. You may reject that opinion; perhaps I do not adopt it myself.

REV JAMES R. PAGE.—Perhaps!

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—Perhaps I do not; perhaps I do; I will not tell you now. I have not come here to-day to give an account of my own opinions, but to distinguish between the doctrines of the holy Catholic Church, and the opinions of individuals, in which you never need concur. This is not a doctrine of the Catholic Church, but the private opinion of these persons. These holy men, I suppose, thought, that, as God employed the agency of Mary to bring into the world Him, who is the only primary and fundamentally meritorious "ground of our hope," so God likewise in some way at least (for instance, through prayer) employs Mary as an instrument in distributing to men all the blessings, that were purchased for them by her Son. If sinful men are the ministers of Christ's grace to other men, why not his pure and holy mother, who was to be "blessed by all generations," as the gospel says? Besides might she not in truth be called in some sense "the only ground of the hope" of mankind, when the archangel was asking her consent to the Incarnation? And then, again, supposing that an all-powerful king had decreed to grant all his favours at the request of a certain faithful minister, might not petitioners call the minister in some sense their "only hope?"—the king all-powerful by his own right of sovereignty, the minister all-powerful by the king's favour or grace. On the *supposition*, therefore, that Jesus, the giver of all good gifts, is pleased to employ his beloved mother to co-operate with others of his servants, by her prayers, in the dispensation of them all—on that supposition (which is but a supposition,) she may innocently be

styled, as the Pope with St. Bernard styles her, “our greatest hope,” as the one who prays most efficaciously to God through Jesus for us, and since, on the preceding supposition, whatever we hope for, *her* prayers *must* ascend before we procure it—and “the entire ground of our hope,” because she brought hope itself into the world when she brought forth Jesus.

The Pope continues—“May she exert her patronage, to draw down an efficacious blessing on our plans and proceedings in the present straitened condition of our Lord’s flock;” that is, may she pray to God for us through Christ, *our* Lord and *her* Lord, our hope and her hope.

To conclude this matter—the peculiar opinions of a Pope are not articles of faith. I respect the personal opinion of my chief pastoral superior on earth, but I am not obliged to adopt it; he is not bound to adopt it himself, he does not require me so to do, but he admits me (and he prays that he may speedily admit you) to his communion, on the sole condition of agreeing with the Church in all articles of the faith, and in points of general discipline, derived from the apostles and required by pastoral authority, according to the wants of the flock for the time being.

As to the real doctrine of the Church on this point, (which I have already stated in the words of the Council of Trent,) I am persuaded that its very amiable, useful and consoling nature, as well as its reasonableness and truth, might soon be made apparent to you, as it has been to so many, who had before protested against it as you now do. You already believe, that God employs spirits called angels, in the ministration of his blessings to men; only a few days ago, you expressed (or you were invited to express) this belief in your churches, by the very prayer used by Catholics throughout the world, and copied into your Prayer-book, for Michaelmas day. Now our Lord tells us, that the saints shall be “like unto the angels;” are they not, then, likewise employed in the

charitable office of administering to their fellow-creatures God's blessings merited by Christ's blood? But beautiful as is this subject, I must not enter on it now. May I recommend you to consult "The Devotion of Catholics to the Blessed Virgin truly represented," by Bishop Challoner, Vicar Apostolic of the London District in the last century: and, may I also recommend you to consult, on another point, the eighth Lecture of Dr. Wiseman, entitled "On the Supremacy of the Pope."

At our last meeting the following was brought forward as an impediment to peace—and I wish now to remove all such impediments; the Council of Ephesus (it was said) forbade the making of another creed after the Nicene creed. We are not obliged to give the name of *creed* or *symbol*, to the profession of faith drawn up by Pope Pius the Fourth. Besides (as many writers observe,) the creed that goes by the name of St. Athanasius, which Protestants use, is generally allowed to have been composed long after the Council of Ephesus. However I make these observations merely in passing, and I answer the objection by replying that what the Council of Ephesus forbade was the making a creed with (or with danger of expressing in it) any doctrine contradictory to the doctrine in the Nicene creed. But Pope Pius the Fourth has not done so; on the contrary he expressly repeats the Nicene creed word for word, in his profession of faith, and expresses after it some articles of christian doctrine, which rest upon the same evidence of Revelation as the Nicene articles preceding them. Pope Pius subjoined the expression of those articles after the Nicene creed, because those articles then began to be publicly contradicted, by persons rising up against the church and beginning then to call themselves by the new name of Protestants. If the articles had not been contradicted, the Pope would not have thought it necessary to make this formal profession

of them; but the Church would have continued teaching them and expressing them in the same forms only, which she had used from the beginning. At the time of the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, Nestorius was openly contradicting the doctrine of the Church on the mystery of the Incarnation—Christ becoming man; but this mystery is expressed with sufficient clearness in the Nicene creed; therefore neither the Pope nor the Council thought it necessary to insert a fresh definition of that article, and expressly prohibited all new forms of creed or symbol circulated by the Nestorians. The Nestorians were at that time circulating new forms, mis-explaining the mystery of the Incarnation, which is definitively explained in the Nicene creed; the Council therefore forbade any such creeds, misinterpreting that article, to be circulated.

I will conclude by reading to you the sixth Action of the Council of Ephesus, which my brother has had the kindness to copy for me from Binius' *Concilia Generalia* in the library of Lord Petre at Thorndon Hall. I have translated a portion of it, which will be sufficient for my present purpose. I translate it thus;—

“Ephesine Council, Action the sixth. The eighth assembly was held principally on this account, that the Nestorians, by showing the more simple people a new confession of faith written by themselves, as if it were the Nicene symbol or creed, were accustomed to deceive them. Charasius, steward of the Church at Philadelphia detected the fraud. To him the Nestorians offered a confession of faith compiled by themselves, to the end that he might receive it. When he had rejected it, and had therefore by their sentence been condemned, he offered the heretical confession of faith, together with a bill attached, to the Council. Which when the Fathers of the Council had read, they immediately with common consent rejected and condemned it; and in order that the more simple and

incautious faithful might not in future be easily deceived, the Council of Ephesus added a canon, That no one under heavy punishments should offer for subscription any profession of faith other than the Nicene, without any addition."

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—Read the words of the Council—the decree itself; we want that.

REV JOSEPH SIDDEN.—I have the whole here in my brother's writing; but the words of a canon or decree of a general Council are weighed and carefully fixed, and a person translating them hastily, impromptu, might alter the sense, which I have no wish to do. I will translate the whole, and let you have it any time; or any other person. I have no edition of the general Councils of the Church in this neighbourhood to consult; I have naturally applied to the quarter where I could find what was wanted.

Another supposed impediment to peace, objected by Messrs. Seymour and Page at our last meeting, was the Breviary, or Divine Office, a part of which the Catholic Church requires all clergymen in holy orders to recite every day of their lives, and which, on an average through the year, occupies about an hour and a quarter of the daily time of those who recite it privately. Before what is called the Reformation, this Divine Office was solemnly sung at several intervals in the day in all the collegiate, cathedral and monastical churches throughout England, as it is still in Catholic countries. "Seven times in the day" (says the royal Psalmist,) "have I said praise to thee." "Peter and John went up to the temple at an hour of prayer" (says St. Luke,)—"the None," or ninth hour.

The recitation of the Breviary, being only a matter of discipline, admits of dispensation or change by proper authority, and under due circumstances. Articles of faith, being truths revealed by God, are unchangeable; with points of discipline it is not so—as

all Catholics admit; they may be wisely changed, by proper ecclesiastical authorities, when the "salus populi" justly calls for such change.

Far the greater portion of the Breviary is composed of holy scripture. Of the remainder a large part is extracted from the writings of the most eminent among the first christians; there are besides some short biographical memoirs, and some hundreds of beautiful prayers. The finest prayers in the Protestant Book of Common Prayer are in our Breviary, and were there before a Protestant Prayer Book was ever heard of. (I make that observation solely in consequence of being interrupted)—

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—The prayers were written before either Popery or Protestantism essentially were framed; that is the fact.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—Well, true in *one* sense, but not as you mean it. The Breviary is admired, and the use of it is extolled by some of the most eminent Anglo-Protestant University men and others now living. I believe some Protestant clergymen have begun to recite it. If proper, I could name a prebendary of a cathedral in a neighbouring county, who lately told a Catholic priest of my acquaintance that he daily reads it with devotion. (Cries of "Name, name.") No, I will not name him; to do so would be improper. (Cries renewed.)

THE CHAIRMAN.—I think you should name him, or not quote the circumstance.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—I have never attended public meetings, and I do not know the rules of them; if I knew their rules, I would not expose myself to be interrupted. I should like very much to see the written rules of public meetings.

THE CHAIRMAN.—The meeting commit it to the Chairman for the time being.

REV. JAMES R. PAGE.—It is not a question about the rules of public meetings; it is a matter of con-

science and honour, whether a man should put forward a statement which he cannot substantiate.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—Being admitted by you to address you at a public meeting, I suppose you receive me as a person, who may be believed on his word.

THE CHAIRMAN.—If you desire to make any quotation of an instance, and the meeting call for the name, either mention the name or refrain from the quotation; that I think will be the best course.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—Very well, sir. I will only add, may God grant that both he and all may soon pray in the communion of the universal Church.

Three or four passages, said to be extracts from the Breviary, were read by Messrs. Seymour and Page at our last meeting, and ridiculed with the utmost marks of contempt. One of the passages read is not to be found in the Breviary, or in any other book that I ever knew. It is a passage relative to a person I never heard of, called St. Emygidius. I have my Breviary; (indeed I have recited a part of it since I came into this Hall, because I came exactly at eleven and the meeting did not commence till near twelve;) I have never seen the passage in this book or any other.

I may observe, with regard to the other two or three passages that were read by these reverend gentlemen, that the miraculous events which they record are not proposed as articles of the faith; no one is required to believe them as a term of communion; therefore they need not be brought forward as impediments to peace. They are introduced as memoirs resting on the testimony of the relators; if that testimony should appear insufficient to the proper pastoral authority, they might be omitted in a future edition of the Breviary. The Breviary has been modified even in my time, and new offices inserted in it.

With regard to one of these *objected* miraculous histories, which, as it happens, refers to the saint of

this day, (the ninth of October,) St. Dionysius, first archbishop of Paris and martyr, the history forms hardly two lines in the day's office, and is expressly introduced as a mere related memoir—" *memoriæ proditum est,*" "it is reported." Many Catholic writers suppose, that the notion of his having taken up his head after it was cut off took its rise from an ancient picture of his martyrdom, in which, to show the manner of his death, he was painted with his head in his hand, also offering it (as it were) to God in testimony of his faith. This mode of painting martyrdoms may have been usual; I know that the great St. Laurence is usually painted with a gridiron, to show the mode of his death; St. Katherine with a wheel, &c. St. John Baptist's head is often painted in a dish, because the Scripture says it was so carried to Herodias.

As to the history relative to the Saint of this day, Catholic writers (among the rest the celebrated Feller) assign the circumstance just mentioned as the probable origin of it. This report, after all, occupies but two short lines of the day's office.

With regard to the history of St. Paul, the first hermit, which was ridiculed by these reverend orators, it rests, among other authorities, on that of St. Athanasius, from whom one of your creeds is called (though not perhaps composed by him); this illustrious patriarch of Alexandria, Athanasius, tells us, that, when concealed from Arian persecution in the deserts of Egypt, he received the account of St. Paul the hermit from his venerable friend St. Antony, who was an eye-witness and party concerned. St. Jerom and several other ancient writers give the same account. However, remember again, it is no article of faith, and therefore need be no impediment to peace.

But let me ask, why may not God be pleased to work miracles under the new covenant, as well as under the old—on behalf of christians, as well as on behalf of Jews. The two lions, issuing from the wood

to prepare a grave for St. Paul, remind me of the two bears springing from the wood to protect the prophet, Eliseus; (as the Bible tells us, 4th book of Kings, chap. 2.)

If St. John Baptist was enabled to leap with joy even in his mother's womb, as the gospel of St. Luke tells us, why may not St. Rose have been enabled to make a vow of chastity in the sixth year of her age? Perhaps too we might consider the warm climate of Peru, where nature is so much sooner matured. However, no one is obliged to believe that circumstance; it is no article of faith, and need be no impediment to peace.

"What," it was asked by Mr. Seymour—"what must be the effect, produced in the mind of Mr. Joseph Sidden, by spending more than an hour every day in reading such a book?" These were his words. I answer, that all such miraculous histories contained in the Breviary, if collected and put together, would perhaps scarcely cover one page in the whole four volumes. I have been using it during twenty years, and must of course be familiar with it; and it is a matter of fact, which any one can ascertain, that all *these* histories on an average scarcely occupy more time in the reading than one minute in a month, instead of one hour every day; and of course they produce but little effect of any kind. The spirit and substance of the Breviary is scriptural and primitively christian, as I said before. Again, therefore, I answer, if Protestant ministers do not find their minds weakened by reading in their bibles the history of Jonas and the whale (Jonas 2.), of Balaam and the ass (Numbers 2.), of Samson and the stream of water springing from the dry tooth of an ass's jaw-bone (Judges 15, 9)—if Protestant ministers do not find their minds weakened by reading these and many similar things in Holy Scriptures, why should Catholic clergymen become enfeebled in their intellects, by passing a few minutes in a year in reading some pious

memoirs, which after all are proposed to them as narrations merely human? We read such things in the newspapers (if we read newspapers regularly) for a greater length of time in the year than we do in our Breviary; and sometimes we are not more obliged to believe them in the one instance than in the other—occasionally indeed the testimony given in the newspapers may be stronger than that, which induced the insertion of *some* narratives in the Breviary. For my part, I see nothing in any of the narratives of scripture or of the Breviary, that is unworthy of God—of a God whose admirable and adorable providence extends to what men call the smallest things and circumstances in the universe as well as to what are great, and before whom indeed all things are great through their connexion with Him, the incomprehensible Eternal—

“Who sees with equal eye, as God of all,
A hero perish or a sparrow fall,
Atoms or systems into ruin hurl’d,
And now a bubble burst, and now a world.”

If I am again asked, what must be the effect on my mind of that daily course of reading, to which the Catholic Church binds her clergy, I will borrow the words of an old acquaintance of yours, the Rev. Hugh M’Neile, at a Manchester meeting a few days ago, and I will ask—Which has the best effect upon the mind of a clergyman, hearing God and speaking to him in the Divine Offices of the Church, or (I now come to Mr. M’Neile’s words) copying the example of “the Protestant clergy of England, who have sought their own ease rather than the salvation of others, who have wasted their time in balls, in parties, in musical festivals,” &c.

Here I think might end another impediment to peace—misrepresentation of the Breviary; but I must say something more about miracles and histories of saints.

Our Lord, in the gospel, promises, that miracles like

his own and even greater should be wrought among the great body of true believers; and no doubt his promise has been and always will be in course of fulfilment in the Catholic Church. Remember, however, that the Church does not require us to believe any *particular instances* of miracles, except those recorded in the scriptures; other miraculous histories offered to our notice are not, therefore, impediments to peace; a prudent man will receive them with that degree of credit, which their testimonial vouchers may deserve. Such, however, is the evidence for many of them, that a man must be mad not to admit them, when he knows the evidence; it would convince any sound jury. I will relate an instance of one miracle, alleged to have been wrought in the Catholic Church—not an account of any thing extraordinarily splendid in it or in its circumstances, and certainly not because I think it extraordinarily well proved, but merely because it was juridically examined into by an Anglo-Protestant Bishop, strongly prejudiced against the Catholic religion—Hall, Bishop of Norwich.

St. Madernus was much honoured in Brittany; his name was also in the highest veneration in Cornwall, where he lived and died—near the Land's End. A chapel there, with a spring of water that bore his name, was long remarked for pilgrimages and miracles. Among the miracles ascribed to St. Madernus, that which follows was attested by Dr. Joseph Hall, the Protestant Bishop of Exeter, afterwards of Norwich, who in 1641 made a juridical and strict enquiry into all the circumstances of the fact, and authentically declared the evidence of the miracle to be incontestible. In his *Treatise on the invisible world* he writes—"The commerce, that we have with the good spirits, is not discerned by the eye, but is, like themselves, spiritual; yet not so, but that even in bodily occasions we have many times insensible helps from them, in such manner as that by the effects we can boldly say, 'Here hath been an angel,' though we see

him not. Of this kind was that (no less miraculous cure) which at St. Madern's in Cornwall was wrought upon a poor cripple, John Trelille, whereof besides the attestation of many hundreds of neighbours *I took a strict and personal examination*, in that last visitation which I either did or ever shall hold. This man, that for sixteen years together was fain to walk upon his hands by reason of the close contraction of the sinews of his legs, upon three admonitions in a dream to wash in that well was suddenly so restored to his limbs, that I saw him able to walk and get his own maintenance. I found there was neither art nor collusion—the thing done, the author invisible." "This" (says a Catholic writer) "was told to the king at Oxford, who caused it to be further examined. Trelille's decrepitude arose from an injured spine, which took away the entire use of his legs and thighs. When cured, he was so strong as to work day labour with other hired servants; and four years after listed himself into the unfortunate king Charles's army, and, having behaved himself with great stoutness and bravery, was in 1644 slain at Lyme in Dorsetshire."

As to the effect of devout biographical reading, encouraged by the Catholic Church, permit me to read you a few extracts from the introduction to "The lives of the fathers, martyrs and other principal saints" &c., collected by an eminent scholar of the last century, the Rev. Alban Butler; they will tend to remove two or three impediments to peace, that were objected at our last meeting;—

"The world is a whirlpool of business, pleasure and sin. Its torrent is always beating upon the hearts of tepid Christians, ready to break in and to bury them under its flood, unless frequent pious reading and consideration oppose a strong fence to its waves. The more deeply a person is immersed in its tumultuous cares, so much the greater ought to be his solicitude to find leisure to breathe after the fatigues and dissipation of business and company, to plunge his heart

by secret prayer in the ocean of the divine immensity, and by pious reading to afford his soul some spiritual refection, as the wearied husbandman, returning from his labour, recruits his spent vigour and exhausted strength by allowing his body necessary refreshment and repose. The lives of the saints furnish the christian with a daily spiritual entertainment, which is not less agreeable than affecting and instructive." "Neither is it a small advantage, that, by reading the histories of the saints, we are introduced into the acquaintance of the greatest personages, who have ever adorned the world, the brightest ornaments of the church militant, and the shining stars and suns of the triumphant—our future companions in eternal glory. Whilst we admire the wonders of grace and mercy, which God hath displayed in their favour, we are strongly moved to praise his adorable goodness; and in their penitential lives and holy maxims, we learn the sublime lessons of practical virtue, which their assiduous meditation on the divine word, the most consummate experience in their deserts, watchings and commerce with Heaven, and the lights of the Holy Ghost (their interior Master) discovered to them." "It is the admonition of St. Paul, that we remember our holy teachers, and that, having the end of their conversation before our eyes, we imitate their faith. For our instruction the Holy Ghost himself inspired the prophets to record the lives and actions of many illustrious saints in the holy scriptures. The church could not in a more solemn manner recommend to us to have these great models often before our eyes, than by inserting in her daily Office an abstract of the lives of the martyrs and other saints—which sacred custom is derived from the primitive ages, in which the histories of the martyrs were publicly read at the divine Office in the assemblies of the faithful, on their annual festivals. This is testified of the acts of St. Polycarp in the life of St. Pionius, and by St. Austin of those of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas, &c. The Council of Africa, under Aure-

lius, Archbishop of Carthage, in 397, mentions the acts of the martyrs being allowed to be read in the church on their anniversary days."

(I have just been admonished by the Chairman, that I have been addressing the meeting for a great length of time, and that some of you are becoming impatient; I am therefore reluctantly obliged to omit much, which I should be happy to introduce to your notice; but for your accommodation, and in compliance with the suggestion of the Chairman, I will do all I can to abridge what I have to offer.)

"St. Boniface" an Englishman sent by Pope Gregory 2nd. to be the Apostle of pagan Germany 1100 years ago, "wrote over to England for books of the lives of the saints" "and by reading the acts of the martyrs animated himself to the spirit of martyrdom." "Joseph Scaliger, a rigid Calvinistic critic, writes as follows on the acts of certain primitive martyrs—"The souls of pious persons are so strongly affected in reading them, that they always lay down the book with regret; this every one may experience in himself. I with truth aver, that there is nothing in the whole history of the Church with which I am so much moved; when I read them, I seem no longer to possess myself." Dr. Palafox, the pious bishop of Osma" in Spain, "in his preface to the fourth tome of the letters of St. Teresa, relates that an eminent Lutheran Protestant minister at Bremen, famous for several works which he had printed against the Catholic Church, purchased the life of St. Teresa, written by herself, with a view of attempting to confute it; but by attentively reading it over was converted to the Catholic faith, and from that time led a most edifying life. The examples of Mr. Abraham Woodhead," of University-College Oxford, and others "were not less illustrious." "All our pretences and foolish objections are silenced, when we see the most perfect maxims of the gospel demonstrated to be very easy by example. When we read how many young noblemen and tender virgins have despised

the world, and joyfully embraced the cross and the labours of penance, we feel a glowing flame kindled in our own breasts and are encouraged to suffer afflictions with patience, and cheerfully to undertake suitable practices of penance. Whilst we see many sanctifying themselves in all states, and making the very circumstances of their condition, whether on the throne or in the army, in the state of marriage or in the deserts, the means of their virtue and perfection, we are persuaded that the practice of perfection is possible also to us in every lawful profession, and that we need only sanctify our employments by a perfect spirit and the fervent exercises of religion to become saints ourselves, without quitting our state in the world. When we behold others, framed of the same frail mould with ourselves, many in age or other circumstances weaker than ourselves and struggling with greater difficulties, yet courageously trampling upon all the obstacles, by which the world endeavoured to obstruct their virtuous choice, we are secretly stung within our breasts, feel the reproaches of our sloth, are roused from our state of insensibility, and are forced to cry out, *Cannot you do what such and such have done?* “We may boldly affirm, that, except the sacred writings, no book has reclaimed so many sinners or formed so many holy men to perfect virtue, as the lives of the saints.” “Though we cannot imitate *all* the actions of the saints, we can learn from them to practice humility, patience, and other virtues, in a manner suiting our circumstances and state of life, and can pray that we may receive a share in the benedictions and glory of the saints. As they, who have seen a beautiful flower-garden, gather a nosegay to smell at the whole day, so ought we in reading to cull out some flowers, by selecting certain pious reflections and sentiments, with which we are most affected; and these we should often renew during the day, lest we resemble a man, who, having looked at himself in a glass, goeth away and forgetteth what he hath seen of himself.”

What I am next about to read from the same eminent author will remove two great impediments to peace, introduced at our last meeting and in this instance I would rather address you in his words than my own.

Some persons "are displeased with all histories of miracles, not considering that these wonders are in a particular manner the works of God, intended to raise our attention to his holy providence, and to awake our souls, to praise his goodness and power, often also to bear testimony to his truth. Entirely to omit the mention of them would be an infidelity in history, and would tend in some measure to obstruct the great and holy purposes, for which they were effected." "But the vigilance of zealous pastors and the repeated canons of the church show, through every age, how much all forgeries and imposture always were the object of their abhorrence. Pope Adrian the First, in an epistle to Charlemagne," a thousand years ago, "mentions this constant severe law of the Church, and says that no Acts of martyrs are suffered to be read, which are not supported by good vouchers. The Council in Trullo and many others down to the present age have framed canons for this purpose." "Pope Galasius the First, in his famous Roman Council in 494, condemns the false Acts of St. George, which the Arians had forged." "*No good end can on any account excuse the least lie.*" "All wilful lying is essentially a sin," (I was myself reproached with duplicity in this room,) "as Catholic divines unanimously teach, with St. Austin against the Priscillianists; it is contrary and most hateful to the God of truth, and a heinous affront and injury offered to our neighbour." "Wilful lying destroys the very end and use of speech, and the sacred bond of society, and all commerce among men; for it would be better to live among dumb persons, than to converse with liars. To tell any lie whatsoever, on the least point relating to religion, is always to lie in a matter of moment, and can never be excused from a *mortal sin*, as

Catholic divines teach. See Nat. Alexander, Collet Hemmo, &c. (on the ten commandments,) on lying." "Grotius, the Protestant Critic," (a name universally known to all who enter into matters of learning,) "takes notice that forgeries cannot be charged upon the Popes, who by the most severe canons forbid them, punish the authors if detected, and give all possible encouragement to judicious critics. This also appears from the works of innumerable learned men among the Catholics, and from the unwearied labours with which they have given to the public the most correct editions of the ancient fathers and historians. Good men may sometimes be too credulous, in things in which there appears no harm; nay, Gerson observes, that sometimes the more averse a person is from fraud himself, the more unwilling he is to suspect imposture in others; but no good man can countenance and abet a known fraud for any purpose whatever. The pretence of religion would *exceedingly aggravate* the crime." "On the diligence of the monks"—(much also was said on this subject, and much that of course must have been exceedingly painful to any one, who had that information which Almighty God has been pleased to give to me;)"—"On their diligence and scrupulosity in general in correctly copying the manuscripts, see Dom. Constant, and the author of the new French *Diplomatique*. A penance is prescribed in the Penitential of Theodore for a monk, who had made any mistake in copying a manuscript. In the year 1196, in the general Chapter of the Cistercians, it was ordered that the Church of Lyons and monastery of Chuni should be consulted about the true reading of a passage in a book to be copied. Anciently books were chiefly copied and preserved in monasteries, which for several ages were the depositories of learning. Mr. Gurdon" (a Protestant) "and Bishop Tanner" (a Protestant Bishop) "take notice, that in England the great abbeys or monasteries were even the repositories of the laws, edicts of kings, and Acts of Parliament. Conringius,

a German Protestant, writes—‘In the sixth, seventh and eighth centuries, there is scarce to be found in the whole Western church the name of a person who had written a book, but what dwelt or at least was educated in a monastery.’ Before universities were erected, monasteries and often palaces of Bishops were the seminaries of the clergy, the nurseries for the education of young noblemen and the great schools of all the sciences. To the labours and industry of the monks we are principally indebted, for the works of the ancients which we possess.”

The mention of monks naturally leads me to another point, objected as a hindrance to Catholic peace at our last meeting. Mr. Seymour or Mr. Page told us some frightful tales about monks, particularly those from the abbey of Melleray, in the province of Brittany in France.

What is a monk or a nun? A man or woman, who endeavours, not only to keep all God’s commandments with the help of his grace, but likewise to observe his counsels too. A monk is one who strives to follow the gospel in perfection. The evangelical counsels given by Christ are chiefly three—voluntary poverty, perpetual chastity, entire obedience. First, voluntary poverty; Matthew, chapter 19, v. 21, “If thou wilt be perfect,” says our Lord, “go, sell what thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven.” Secondly, perpetual chastity; Matthew, chapter 19, v. 12, “There are” (our Lord says) “eunuchs, who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven;” “all men” (he says) “take not this word, but they only to whom it is given;” “he that can take, let him take,” are the words of Jesus Christ. In his 1st epistle to the Corinthians, chapter 7, v. 7, St. Paul says, “I would that all men were even as myself,” (unmarried, as he tells us elsewhere,) “but every one hath his proper gift from God; he that is without a wife is solicitous

for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please God, but he that is with a wife is solicitous for the world, how he may please his wife, and he is divided ;” again, says the apostle, “ He that giveth his virgin in marriage doth well, and he that giveth her not doth better.” Revelation, chapter 14, verse 4—“ These are they, which were not defiled with women, for they are virgins ; these follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth.” Thirdly, entire obedience ; Christ says in the gospel, “ If any man will come after me, let him deny himself.” Matt. 21, v. 24.

The Church forbids any to enter the monastic state of life, until they shall have earnestly endeavoured to discover whether such is the will of God respecting them ; and it is strictly required, that all applicants to become monks or nuns should pass a year or two in a noviceship or trial of the obligations of this state before they can be permitted to make a vow or solemn promise to God of serving him in it for the rest of their lives. Of course such a vow, when once deliberately made, must be religiously observed. Witness Deuteronomy, chapter 23, verses 21 to 23—“ When thou hast made a vow to the Lord thy God, he will require it ; and if thou delay, it shall be imputed to thee as a sin ;” “ thou shalt observe and do as thou hast promised to the Lord thy God.” And St. Paul, speaking of widows who were for marrying after having made such a vow as this, says (1st Timothy, chapter 5, v. 12), “ They have damnation, having cast off their first faith.” The use of the gospel helps, which are prayer, fasting, works of mercy, and the frequent use of the sacraments, will bring grace from Christ to enable men to keep with fidelity their vows to God, if duly employed.

There are different orders of monks, who observe different particular rules of life, though all agreeing in the same gospel spirit. The monks misrepresented at your last meeting follow a rule, drawn up by the great St. Bernard before mentioned. These good

monks were accused in this town, by Messrs. Seymour and Page, of being guilty of treason—of being such hateful characters, that it was praiseworthy in the inhabitants of an island in the British Channel (who, it was said, knew pretty well what monks were,) to go down to the shore armed with muskets, to drive them out to sea. The channel islanders were actually praised by Mr. Seymour, for this barbarity towards their unarmed fellow countrymen flying for liberty and life. Of such un-English and unchristian behaviour, I cannot believe the islanders were ever guilty; I think there must be some mistake, but (if necessary) I can easily ascertain. Again; these monks were accused by Messrs. Seymour and Page of going about to get money on false pretences, and, again, of doing this that they might employ the money in living in ease and luxury. Finally, they were accused of telling parties that they might live in known sin, indulging their sensual passions, neglecting sacraments and all the means of grace and salvation, under the notion that nothing would be required from them by Almighty God, so long as the monks were but well paid to do all for them. In short, we were literally told by these reverend gentlemen, that monks teach people to say their prayers and take the sacrament *by proxy*—to live a sinful life in reality, and a virtuous life by proxy.

Justice to the slandered monks and respect for my audience compel me to remove this impediment. Twelve years ago, I was myself, during two or three months an eyewitness to the very edifying observance of their holy rule by a community of about a hundred and sixty of these very same Cistercian monks, at their most interesting establishment of La Meilleraie in the department of the Loire Inferieure in France. The following remarks, from a note in the life of St. Robert Abbot of Molesme, by the venerable Alban Butler, agrees with what I witnessed. He speaks of persons visiting the monastery;—

“ One of the lay brothers opens the door to strangers, prostrates himself before them, and then leads them first to the chapel, and, after a short prayer, into a parlour, but desires them, while within the monastery, to refrain from speaking of news or any worldly affairs. Only the abbot, prior or guest-master are allowed to speak to them. The monks,” (that is, these Cistersian monks; they are the most severe order in the Church;)—“ the monks are never allowed to speak to visitors nor to one another, otherwise than by signs, except it be to their superior or confessor. They never write to their friends in the world after their profession, nor hear any thing relating thereto, being content to know that *there is* a world that they may pray for it through Christ Jesus. When the parent of any monk dies, the news is only sent to the prior, who tells the community that the father of one of them is dead, and orders their joint prayers for his soul.” (I recollect hearing the abbot give that information to them, that a parent of one of them was dead; and I noticed the edifying effect of the news upon the whole community; each began to pray as for his own parent.) “ When a novice is about to make his profession, he writes to his friends to take his last leave of them, and makes a renunciation of whatever he possesses in favour of his heirs, but gives some part to the poor, to be distributed in his own country; for nothing is received by the monastery, which, though its revenues are not large, maintains a great multitude of distressed persons. The monks till their ground themselves. They usually keep their eyes cast down, and never look at strangers, but make them a low bow if they pass by. When Pope Innocent the Third, returning from the Emperor’s Court, called at St. Bernard’s monastery, he took notice that not one of the monks lifted up his eyes to see him or his attendants, so much were they dead to all curiosity and to whatever could interrupt their attention to God—which made that great Pope call St. Bernard’s

monastery 'the wonder of the world.' In like manner to see the monks of La Trappe, in the fields, at work, at meals, and particularly in the church, is a most moving spectacle. The more perfectly to renounce their own will, they are bound to obey, not only their superior, but the least sign of any other, even the last among the lay brothers." "Their drink," (here is the "*luxurious living*" of the monks!)—"their drink is a weak cyder, such as is used by the poorest people in Normandy. On fast days they eat only dry herbs boiled with a little salt, with a piece of coarse bread, and are allowed only half a pint of cyder. On other days," not fast days, "they have a herb soup," (I saw it,) "a desert of a radish or two or a few walnuts or some such thing, and a mess either of lentils, hasty pudding, roots, or the like. They never eat fish on any account, and never touch eggs or flesh meat, unless when very sick" and desired to do so by the doctor; and then only——

REV. JAMES R. PAGE.—Mr. Chairman, as I am accountable to this meeting for the permission Mr. Sidden has had, I beg to observe that his letter asked that he should "speak from one to two hours," and that I granted that request, but my arrangement was that Mr. Sidden should *speak* not *read*, from one to two hours, as requested. He has been reading the whole of his address, and I really think the time of the meeting is of too much consequence to be wasted by his now reading a dissertation about the diet of monks.

THE CHAIRMAN.—You state, "Of course I shall be allowed from one to two hours, if convenient to me, to address the meeting before the reverend orators you name;" the secretary answers, "The wish you express to *speak* first is willingly acceded to."

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—I fixed my attention upon the words before that—"addressing the meeting;" I anticipated no objection to my reading. The secretary says—"No restriction will be imposed on you as

to the length of time it may be your pleasure to occupy in addressing the meeting." I prepared my matter accordingly.

THE CHAIRMAN.—It is no personal matter with me. If it is the opinion of the meeting, that Mr. Sidden should still go on reading this account, I am quite willing to sit here to hear him. (Cries of "No, no; the two hours are expired.")

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—Then may I be allowed to give my conclusion? I will omit a very large portion which intervenes between this and my conclusion, however detrimental such omissions may be to my course of reply to the objections of Messrs. Seymour and Page.

THE CHAIRMAN.—The meeting have shown themselves most willing to hear every thing you have to say, within reasonable limits.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—I will omit a very large portion. I was going to read an extract from a letter now in my hand, which I myself wrote to my mother from the monastery where I was: I omit it—and also a considerable extract from a sermon of the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer, (formerly a Protestant Minister, now a Catholic Priest,) which he preached at the opening of the Church of Mount St. Bernard in Leicestershire, just built by the very monks at a place where they have been most honourably received.

You may remember, that, after the last revolution in France, (in 1830,) English and Irish became objects of suspicion in that country, and numbers hastened back to England in expectation of war. The *lives* of many were certainly in danger from popular violence. I am personally acquainted with some, who were most unreasonably suspected and threatened. The monks of Meilleraie were for the most part English and Irish natives, (this was their "treason"—they were natives of England and Ireland,) and they fled from the faction that ill treated them as such; the *Frenchmen* of the monastery remained, and are there to this time.

The fugitive Irish monks were hospitably received in Ireland by Sir Richard Keane, Bart. and others. The following passage respecting them is taken from the work of one of the Commissioners appointed by Government for the late Irish Poor Law Enquiry—Mr. Binns, who from education was prejudiced against the Catholic religion.—I suppose I must omit it; it may be found in the Dublin Review, No. 8, page 436.—They were hospitably received in Leicestershire, by Ambrose Lisle Philipps, Esquire, of Grace Dieu Manor, deputy Lieutenant of the County, and son of the County Member, nephew of the late Earl of Harrowby, and of Dr. Ryder late Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry. The latest intelligence which I have of the monks of Mount St. Bernard was written not many days ago. It is exceedingly useful in my argument; but I omit it, because it is not in my own handwriting and there seems to be an objection to my reading from books; you may find it in the Number of the Catholic Magazine for this month. I may add, that an opulent and intelligent Leicestershire farmer has just told an acquaintance of mine, that the agriculture of these laborious and beneficent monks on the hitherto barren Charnwood hills is a model for the whole neighbourhood. The same is far more extensively true of their brethren at Mount Melleray Abbey in the County Waterford, where they are justly represented as the benefactors of their country, as Mr. Binns and even the English journals inform us.

As to the prayers and works of piety, which the monks offer to God for all mankind and in particular for their benefactors, the monks know, as well as every instructed Catholic, that any thing done by one man on earth for another cannot be available before God, otherwise than as a means of obtaining for the latter through Christ grace to pray for himself and to cultivate the love of God in his own breast. There is no such thing, therefore, as praying *by proxy*, or going to Communion by proxy; these absurdities have no ex-

istence, except in the imaginations of ignorant or prejudiced people. If the monks pray for their benefactors, it is to beg of God to give grace to their benefactors to pray for themselves. If they offer in the spirit of prayer a communion to God through Christ for their benefactors, it is that their benefactors may receive grace frequently to make a worthy communion themselves. If they more frequently offer certain prayers for their richer and more liberal benefactors, perhaps this in the order of Providence may be a sort of compensation for the spiritual disadvantages encountered by the rich. "It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle," (says our Lord in the gospel,) "than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven;" and Christ expressly counsels the rich thus to "make friends of the mammon of iniquity, that, when they fail, these may receive them into everlasting mansions." (Luke 16. 6.)

At the last meeting, I remember that Messrs. Seymour and Page were expressing their horror, at having just seen in London some inscriptions on the walls dissuading people from praying for the Queen—a custom, by the bye, which we observe in our Catholic temples every Sunday and Holy day, and whenever we say Mass. Now I want to know, if, when Messrs. Seymour and Page pray for the Queen, they intend thereby to save her Majesty the trouble, or rather to deprive her of the pleasure, of praying for herself. Can any body be so besotted, as to suppose, that, if people pray for their prince, the prince prays only by proxy? Certainly not. Judge of the monks, then, as you would have them judge of you—and how much laboured declamation falls idle to the ground! We shall hear no more I dare say of monks encouraging ladies and gentlemen to go on sinning as fast as they can, and saying their prayers by proxy. For the credit of our fellow countrymen I hope they were not so inhospitable, so un-English, as to meet these good, laborious, useful men with muskets, when flying from

revolutionary violence; I hope at least, that the Islanders did not know them to be charitable, virtuous, and pious monks, which is probable enough, (if there *be any* truth in the story,) since, knowing that France was in a state of political confusion, they might imagine that hostile invaders of some sort were attempting to land. I believe however that it is *not* true. (*To Mr. Seymour*) I do not mean to say, sir, that you would tell a story, which you did not think to be true; it is your head I hope that has erred, and not your heart. As to what Mr. Seymour called "the good old Norman custom of every man carrying arms," I was sorry to hear it called good; I think it a mark of barbarism; "the sword of the Spirit" is the only weapon that I can admire: "they, who take the sword, shall perish by the sword," says our Lord.

But to conclude this point, let me ask what can be the source of all this ignorance and prejudice against monks and nuns. You shall hear it from one, who laboured under the prejudice himself.—But I omit all this.

After all, the monastic state is not *essential* to the Catholic religion. The Church does not require any to embrace it as a term of communion with her; on the contrary she leaves all at liberty to do as they think proper in this respect. She has made regulations to *prevent* people from embracing it *too hastily*, and will not have men enter on it at all, unless they feel convinced that they are called to it by God himself, the father of the human family who allots to all his servants their proper stations in his household. Here I hope ends another impediment to peace.

Two or three circumstances were mentioned at the last meeting, with which I conclude. I feel it my duty to notice these; although it is painful to be obliged to take such a course.

Mr. Seymour told us, that he himself had known an instance in Ireland of a man being murdered by his

Catholic wife and children because he had become a Protestant.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—By his uncle and nephew.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—Very well; murdered by an uncle and nephew because he had become a Protestant. Now I want to know the name of this man—

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—His name was O'Connor.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—His station—

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—His station was Killery, county Sligo.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—I want to know the time—

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—When I was curate of the parish, in the year 1828.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—Well, perhaps you will give me these particulars in writing, and let me proceed; I have just finished. I want to know what magistrate the reverend speaker gave notice to—

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—Mr. Ormsby of Castle Dargan, and Mr. Johnstone of Friars Town.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—For of course, if no one *else* informed, *he* did, since he thought it worth his while even to bring the news to us at Guildford in 1838. I want to know at what assizes the criminals were tried—

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—They were never tried, but the facts were developed at the inquest. In the madness and confusion of that unfortunate country, they could never be brought to trial.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—I was going to ask whether they were hung, as they ought to have been, if convicted, *whatever may have been their motive*.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—They were never even caught.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—Or, of course they would have been tried, and, if guilty, most justly executed.

We had another accusation, still more awfully horrid than that just mentioned. The reverend gen-

tleman was describing the great love of the Irish people for the Protestant parsons, as *he* called them; at the moment I really thought he was joking, when he talked of the great love of the Irish people for the Protestant parsons; but he was *not* joking, it appears, for he went on to say that none could be better disposed to Protestantism than the Irish, if they were but left to themselves, instead of being urged on by the Catholic priests to persecute and murder the Protestant parsons. Sir, it is deeply distressing to me, to be thus obliged to mention so abominable a charge, made by a person here present indiscriminately against an absent body of several thousand of christian pastors—his fellow-countrymen, my fellow-clergymen, the religious guides of seven millions of our fellow-subjects. Is there one single man, that believes this accusation just? It is so totally unjust, so extravagant, so dreadfully revolting, that I cannot bear to dwell upon it; I must dismiss it as shortly as I can. I ask, what are the *names* of the priests, who incite their people to murder the parsons? what are the names of their parishes? also, *when* did they teach murder? *when* did they impiously reverse the divine command, “Thou shalt not kill?” These are questions, which ought to be answered. When and where was the law of the land enforced against these apostles of Satan (I call them), these instigators to murder?

REV. JAMES R. PAGE.—If you refer to the evidence taken before the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Irish education, and that on Intimidation at Elections, you will find many proofs of the violent and murderous language of the Romish priests, and of their efforts to incite the people against the clergy and loyal subjects of the land; and if you want names, we can supply them.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—May I ask if the gentleman remembers the name of the Rev. Mr. Gathercole, an Anglo-Protestant Minister, who was tried at the assizes at York last summer, and convicted of slan-

dering some Catholic religious communities and clergymen in the north of England, and I believe is now awaiting his sentence? He was found guilty by a jury, consisting either mostly or perhaps wholly of Protestant gentlemen, whose names I have; I have his trial here, but I will not now produce it.

Need I say, Sir, that if one single Catholic clergyman had lost the grace of God, or lost his senses, so far as to incite men to the commission of murder, the people would have fled from him in abhorrence, and, even if the law of the land had been asleep, his Bishop would instantly have interfered, and would have degraded him, as Judas was degraded even from among the apostles chosen by our Lord himself. Give me the name of even one such wretched man—be prepared with your proofs—and I will write to his Bishop without delay, when I am furnished with all particulars. But what am I saying? If any one here present knows, that any other members of the community have been inciting men to the commission of murder, of course he has informed the magistrates, the peace of society is secured, and the wretched criminals are now suffering for their crime. Well, who are they then? in what prison? If there be a person here present, who knows that any Irish Catholic priests incite the people to murder the parsons, of course I *must* assume that those priests are now in some state of confinement, or perhaps sent to another world to answer for their crime. I cannot, Mr. Seymour, help saying, I could not believe it. Nature and experience alike forbid me.

REV. JAMES R. PAGE.—It was proved before the Bench of Magistrates, and admitted by priest Hughes, that he had desired the people to stick them with pitchforks and drown them in bog-holes.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—What madhouse is he shut up in?

REV. JAMES R. PAGE.—No madhouse; he is promoted.

THE CHAIRMAN.—Perhaps, Mr. Sidden, you had better finish your speech, before questions are answered; but it shall be which you wish.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—I had better finish my speech first.

Who are they, then? who convicted them? In what gaol are they suffering? Upon what scaffold has flowed their blood, as the aiders, abettors and instigators of murder? I have personally known several Irish Catholic clergymen, but I am not now going to proclaim the praises of that pious and laborious body, to which they belong. Their best praise is their people's love; the nation's reverence. But for their holy and charitable zeal and influence with their grateful affectionate people, the conduct of certain *others* might perhaps long ago have drawn down upon them, from the heated passions of some oppressed and unprincipled persons, a severe retribution. The *priests*, I have no doubt, have often *prevented* murder. A few days ago, I happened to meet with a most interesting general character of the Irish people, which forcibly struck my attention because it fell from the lips of one of their influential public enemies, and because it agrees in a great measure with my own observation—for I have had some thousands of good-hearted Irish people under my pastoral care.

To conclude this, by reading the character just mentioned, will be a relief after what I have now been speaking to; however I am forgetting—I must omit it, for it is in print.

Nothing that was said at the last meeting, on the subject of *persecution*, can be any impediment to peace. The Catholic or *universal Church*, whose minister I am, never taught the persecution of men for conscience sake, and never practised it. *Some* Catholics have taught, that civil governments, when there is danger of sedition or rebellion about pretended religious matters, may justly make persecuting laws, and

act on them too; but the Catholic Church has never taught this as an article of the faith; to believe it is not a term of communion; nor have I ever heard a single Catholic express even as his opinion, that religious persecution was the spirit of the Gospel. Besides, if some Catholics as politicians have taught persecution and practised it, so have some Protestants, and with far less excuse. Not only have Protestants often legally and illegally persecuted Catholics, in the most savage manner and to an enormous extent; but the different Protestant sects have often most cruelly prosecuted each other. I was about to read proofs from Protestant writers as well as Catholic; Luther, Beza, Brandt, Stuart, Neale, Estius, Challoner, Lingard, Milner, Dr. Brown in his notes to "*Equal Laws for Ireland*," &c. But this I must omit. As to Catholic Pastors, they have expressly declared that persecution is not the ecclesiastical discipline. The eleventh General Council, the third of Lateran (A.D. 1179, when the murderous and abominably lewd doctrines and deeds of the Bulgari, Albigenses, &c. were raging,) when 302 Bishops were assembled and Pope Alexander the Third presided, proclaimed in the twenty-seventh canon, that "the ecclesiastical discipline, content with the sacerdotal judgment, does not effect bloody punishments;" these are the words of the canon, quoting Pope Leo the Great, of the fourth century. The eleventh Primatial Council of Toledo in Spain, A.D. 675, chapter 3, declares—"It is not lawful for those, by whom the sacraments of the Lord are to be dispensed, to pass judgment of blood or inflict any mutilations whatsoever of limbs, or command them to be inflicted; but if any one shall have done any such thing against any person whatsoever, let him be deprived of the honour of the order granted to him," &c. And, again, the same Council says, (chapter 7,) "Benevolence, rather than severity, ought to be employed towards those who are to be corrected, exhortation rather than violence, charity

rather than power," &c. It is well known, that, when king James the Second of England consulted Bossuet Bishop of Meaux—but as that is not in my hand-writing I shall not read it, though I have it here. No more, then, of persecution as an impediment to peace. I could have treated the matter at much greater length, and with reason under other circumstances. I have received a very long anonymous letter from Guildford upon the subject of persecution—at least I judge it is from hence, as it has the Guildford postmark. If the writer is present, I hope I have removed his difficulty; it would give me great pleasure to know this.

I conclude. The words—"without which no one can be saved"—at the end of the profession of faith by Pope Pius the Fourth, were objected to at our last meeting. I then replied, that every Catholic, when he says those words, understands them as follows—without which no one can be saved *provided he has had sufficient means of acquiring the knowledge of it*;—which is a matter to be decided upon by God at every man's death. Besides, the very same words occur in the Athanasian Creed, which Anglo-Protestants in their Common Prayer Book are required to use thirteen times a year. If Messrs. Seymour and Page will insist that I pronounce damnation upon every Protestant, I may insist that they pronounce damnation upon Unitarians, and all who do not believe the Athanasian Creed. When I say "Without which no one can be saved"—I mean that no one can be saved, who denies any article of this Catholic faith whilst he has sufficient grace from God to know that Christ teaches that article by his Church. Wilfully to reject this grace when offered is a sin; but is it always sufficiently offered to every individual among mankind? No one will be excluded from salvation, who does not die under the guilt of deadly sin. Catholic divines teach, that to be ignorant of a truth, which we have not had sufficient means to know, is no sin at all.

Now if it does happen, that a person dies without having had sufficient means to believe the Articles of Catholic Faith contained in the Profession of Faith worded by Pope Pius IV., in that case all Catholics would agree that he will not be excluded from salvation *on account of* his not having believed them. Still the consequences of his want of knowing and believing these articles may be detrimental to him in many ways, both in time and in eternity. I am allowed by the Catholic Church to believe, that God brings his elect to eternal bliss, sometimes by means of their knowledge of the articles of the Catholic faith, sometimes in spite of their want of that knowledge. And I do think so. And I have now the consolation to express my earnest hope, that every person here present may be admitted to the possession of eternal bliss after his death through the infinite merits of Jesus Christ, whether he shall receive grace to join my communion before his death, or whether he shall not have the happiness externally to do so. The Catholic Church forbids me not to entertain this hope: and, though not unmingled with fear, it is one of the sweetest comforts of life; I repeat it, I hope that I am even now addressing a company of well-meaning though mistaken people, with whom I shall be united in the regions of eternal bliss through Jesus Christ the Lord and Father of the great family of mankind.

The approved sentiments of Catholics, with regard to those who differ from them in religion, are expressed in the beautiful words of the great St. Austin—words which are familiar to Catholics; here they are, adopted by Bishop Milner (the Catholic Bishop of the Midland district of England), as the motto of his great work *The end of religious controversy*—"Let those," (he speaks to persons, who are not yet externally joined with the holy Catholic Church, though perhaps they may internally be joined with it, on account of the sincere affection of their hearts towards God, and on account of their not having had sufficient

means to know its divine authority; and as *he* speaks, so do I, so does every Catholic throughout the world wish to speak to those, who are not outwardly joined with him in religious communion; they are the sentiments, which I entertain towards you, my dear sirs, (to Mr Seymour and Mr. Page,) and which I beg Almighty God may accomplish for you both through eternity;—"Let those," (says St. Austin, and after him Bishop Milner,) "let those treat you harshly, who are not acquainted with the difficulty of attaining to truth and avoiding error; let those treat you harshly, who know not how hard it is to get rid of old prejudices; let those treat you harshly, who have not learnt how very hard it is to purify the interior eye, and render it capable of contemplating the sun of the soul, TRUTH. But as to us, we are far from this disposition towards persons, who are separated from us, not by errors of their own invention, but by being entangled in those of others; we are so far from this disposition, that we pray to God, that, in refuting the false opinions of those whom you follow, not from malice but imprudence, He would bestow upon us that spirit of peace, which feels no other sentiment than charity, no other interest than that of Jesus Christ, no other wish but for your salvation."

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—Mr. Chairman, I feel confident that I shall not in vain entreat the indulgence of this large assembly, while I proceed to reply to the statements which have just fallen from the Rev. Joseph Sidden. I would entreat the indulgence of the meeting, inasmuch I must answer, *extemporaneously* and on the moment, a statement, that has been for the last six weeks in the process of committing to paper, and has been deliberately *perused* (not spoken) to you on the present occasion. And not only has this statement been thus deliberately written

and prepared for you, but, before ever it was read this day, it has been advertised for sale in the London magazines.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—No ; never, never.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—I am directly contradicted. My answer is this. I hold in my hand *The Catholic Magazine*, and I will read the advertisement!

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—It is not the advertisement of the speech that I have made. It is of a speech *I intended to deliver, not the one I have delivered.*

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—Let us have plain and English dealing here, and we shall see that it is *not* something he has not delivered yet ; his words are —“ Discourse *delivered* in the Town Hall, Guildford, on the 14th of August and 9th of October, before the Guildford Protestant Association and others, (the Mayor, Joseph Haydon, Esq., in the chair,) by the Rev. Joseph Sidden, Catholic Pastor, of Sutton Place.”

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—Here is that pamphlet ; any one may read it, and they will not find in it one word of what I have uttered to-day. I must go to Mr. Russell’s this evening about it ; and any one may purchase it there. You will not let me utter it.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—Well, sir, I hope that the indulgence of the meeting will be afforded to me, while I reply to the statement that *has* been delivered and which we *have* heard ; because to answer that which is yet *in embryo*, or which he only *intended* to deliver, is more than I can at present undertake. But if there was nothing that would shrink from concealment in this discourse which is still in embryo, though advertised as already “*delivered* before the Guildford Protestant Association and others,” and if there be any statement of importance in it, surely it should have been brought forth on this public plat-

form before those who are ready and able to answer it, instead of waiting till we have left the town, and then inviting the inhabitants to purchase it.

But, sir, I am unwilling to occupy the time—already so far consumed—with merely prefatory remarks; I would rather come at once to the statements made by the reverend gentleman. And I confess, my only difficulty is the variety of the topics he introduced, the number of the allusions he made, and the consequent difficulty of dealing with them all in detail. But yet my difficulty is not so great, as it at first appears; for I am sure that it is the conviction of this meeting, as it certainly is my own, that a very large portion of that elaborately written statement does not require and does not *deserve* any laboured examination upon my part, and that the portion of it, which requires to be unravelled and set right before the public, is very limited indeed. To that portion I shall call the attention of the present meeting, with as much conciseness as the subject will admit.

And, sir, to commence with that, with which the reverend gentleman concluded—namely, his indignation at the charge of persecution against the Church of Rome—I would refer to that which he himself has cited, namely, the canon of the third Council of Lateran. And by the garbled manner—by the unfair manner in which this gentleman has cited this well-known canon—by his quoting only a single sentence and declining to read the whole of it when I required it of him, he has afforded a signal and useful illustration of the exceeding difficulties with which we have to struggle, in the unfair conduct of this controversy at the hands of the Roman Catholic priests.

It is my duty to inform this meeting, that he read scarcely one sentence from that canon. And when I called upon him to read the whole of it, as enacted on the subject of persecution, he declined; but, as I fortunately possess the canon—having brought it with

me to the meeting—I will read it, that this assembly may conjecture the true motive of Mr. Sidden's declining to read it.

The words, which the reverend gentleman cited, are these—"The ecclesiastical discipline, content with the sacerdotal judgment, does not inflict bloody punishments."

Now the whole canon is as follows:—"Whereas blessed Leo saith, that *although* ecclesiastical discipline, being content with the judgment of the priest, doth not inflict bloody vengeance, *yet* it is assisted by the edicts of Catholic princes, so that men often seek a remedy unto salvation while they dread that corporal punishment will befall them, THEREFORE WE RESOLVE to subject to an ANATHEMA all, who shall presume to receive or shelter in their houses or lands those who are called Puritans, Patrins or Publicans.

"And we enjoin all the faithful, that for the remission of their sins they oppose themselves manfully to such horrors, and defend a christian people from them *by force of arms*. Trusting also in the mercy of God and the authority of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, *We take off two years penance from all faithful christians, who shall take arms for the purpose of subduing them*, according to the counsel of their bishops or other prelates; *and if they shall be engaged in this service longer than two years*, we leave to the discretion of the bishops to grant them *more ample indulgences* in proportion to the extent of their labours."

There is the decree, in all its length and its breadth, to which the reverend gentleman has himself referred, and of which he has stated to this meeting that it was a proof that the church of Rome did *not* sanction persecution! This meeting may now judge for itself, as to the true cause of his quoting only a garbled sentence of this canon, and declining to read the remainder. It is not only a decree to subject to an anathema all who would dare to shelter the poor and persecuted heretic, but also to give two years' remission of pe-

nance to all who would take up arms against them, and it enacts, that, should they continue for a longer period than two years at the holy work of subduing heretics by force of arms, the bishops shall have the power of giving them *still more ample indulgences!*

But, sir, there is another Council likewise designated the Council of Lateran—a Council which is approved in the decrees of that Council of Trent, to which the Rev. Mr. Sidden has so frequently adverted; I allude to the fourth Council of Lateran. And the reverend gentleman, I am sure, will be so kind as to inform the meeting, whether he acknowledges this as one of the infallible Councils of his Church.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN—I believe it is.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR—Now in that Council—the authority of which is here acknowledged by Mr. Sidden—there is another decree on the subject of persecution, it is as follows :—

“Let the heretics after their condemnation be given up to the secular powers or their officers, *to be punished* according to their demerits, the clergy being first degraded. Let their goods be confiscated, if they laics; and if they be clergy, let them be applied to the use of the church. Let those likewise, who lie under vehement *suspicion* of heresy, be anathematised, unless they give proofs of their innocence, and, if they remain for a year under the sentence of anathema, let them be condemned as heretics. Let the temporal lords be admonished, and (if necessary) *compelled* by the censures of the Church, that, as they desire to be accounted faithful, they take an oath *to exterminate all heretics* or excommunicated persons, who may be within their territories. And let every person whatsoever be bound by oath to observe this chapter, before he is admitted to any authority, temporal or spiritual. But if the temporal lord, being required and admonished by the Church, shall neglect to purge his land of this heretical filthiness, let him be excommunicated by the Metropolitan and the other Bishops of

the Province, and, if he prove contumacious, let notice be given at the end of the year to the sovereign Pontiff, in order that he may pronounce the vassals *absolved from allegiance—and give up their land to be occupied by Catholics*, who when they shall have extirminated the heretics, are to possess the land without opposition, saving however the right of the lord paramount, provided he offer no hindrance or impediment; and let the Catholics, who, taking upon them the badge of the cross, shall gird themselves to the extermination of heretics, enjoy the same indulgences and sacred privileges, which are granted to those who go to the Holy Land."

Such is the canon of the Council of Lateran—a Council, the authority of which Mr. Sidden has this day admitted. And this canon not only provides for the *persecution*, but the utter *extirpation* of heretics. And it further enacts, that, if the great Lords or Sovereigns of the territory shall not assist the priesthood in their atrocious work of extirpating the heretics, their lands and territory shall be forfeited, their subjects released of their oaths and allegiance, and their dominion transferred to more obedient vassals of the Church of Rome! Such is the canon of the Church of Rome; and yet the reverend gentleman affects a display of holy indignation, that that Church should be accused of encouraging persecution!

Here there are two canons, from the third Council of Lateran and the fourth Council of Lateran, establishing and enforcing the practice of persecution in its fiercest forms, while the reverend gentleman himself has partially quoted one of these canons, thus recognising its authority, and he has admitted the infallibility of the Council by which the other was enacted. And therefore for that gentleman to deal forth upon us his language of indignation, at the charge of his church sanctioning persecution—for him to hurl the thunder of his indignation and the lightning of his eloquence against us—will appear to men of simple minds

or of reasonable judgments to be but a waste of words to serve a purpose, when they find the practices of persecution inculcated and encouraged in the strongest terms in these canons of the Church of Rome, which the reverend gentleman himself has acknowledged as binding upon him, in the presence of this meeting.

But lest it should be thought, that these principles are not so generally circulated among Roman Catholics, as some are disposed to believe, I must invite your attention to the volume which I hold in my hand—the Roman Catholic Testament with notes. I doubt not, that many in this assembly have already heard of these *edifying* notes, which the Romish priesthood have appended to the scriptures of God. I would invite attention to those notes, that the present meeting may understand the spirit of these men, when they are not speaking to an assembly of Protestants as on the present occasion, but when they are teaching in private and writing only for the instruction of a Roman Catholic population.

On that remarkable text in the Apocalypse, which speaks of a certain “woman drunk with the blood of the saints and of the martyrs of Jesus,” they have appended the following note. “The Protestants foolishly expound this of Rome, for that there they put heretics to death and allow of their punishment in other countries; but their blood” (that is, the blood of Protestants) “is not called ‘the blood of saints,’ any more than the blood of thieves, men-killers and other malefactors, *for the shedding of which by order of justice no commonwealth shall have to answer.*” Thus the blood of a heretic is as the blood of murderers and robbers, and the State shall not have to answer for the shedding of their blood! Such is this ferocious note.

After this, men may believe, if they can, the professions of love and kindness we hear so frequently from the emissaries of Rome; for myself I have no wish to doubt the statements of the individual, who has addressed you this day, but I feel that we must

always bear in mind, in reference to such professions, that the principle of the church of Rome is that persecution is a necessary consequence of her love to our souls and her fervent anxiety for our salvation. It is on the principle that our bodies may be externally constrained, in order that our souls may be saved in "the day of the Lord Jesus," that they undertake to compel us into the bosom of that church! and thus on their principle they manifest their love for our souls, even amidst the racks of the Inquisition and the fires of persecution!

And now, sir, I turn to another note, of a similar nature, in this Roman Catholic Testament. It will be remembered, that, on a remarkable occasion in the gospels, some of the disciples asked of our Lord in their indignation, "Lord! wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven and consume them, even as Elias did?" The answer of our Lord was that beautiful and emphatically *Christian* sentiment—"Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of; for the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." With these words before them—words that lay the axe at the very root of all persecution—they deliberately undertake to answer and confute the conclusion deducible from these words of our Lord. They say—"Not justice nor all rigorous punishment of sinners is here forbidden, nor the act of Elias reprehended, nor the church nor Christian princes blamed for *putting heretics to death*, but that none of these should be done for desire of our particular revenge, or without discretion and regard to their amendment and example to others."

It is thus they endeavour to justify, not only persecution, but persecution even unto death, notwithstanding the affecting and decisive language of our Lord in forbidding it. This note is an atrocious effort to justify the civil authorities in putting heretics to death, with the significant caution that it should be done with *discretion*. And we are left to conclude,

if Roman Catholics do not persecute in this land, it is because such a procedure at this moment might be very far from *discreet*.

This willingness to persecute is further illustrated by the assertion, that God has given to the priesthood the power of life and death over those who refuse submission to their will. This appears from the following note on Deut. 18. 8;—

“Here we see what authority God was pleased to give to the church guides of the Old Testament, in deciding without appeal all controversies relating to the law, promising that they should not err therein; and *punishing with death* such as proudly refused to obey their decisions; and *surely he has not done less for the church guides of the New Testament.*”

Here is a broad assertion of their right to punish us with death itself, because we will not bow to their authority!

But when the reverend gentlemen, travelling on in his statement, adverted to the Romish priesthood of Ireland, and the state of that poor and afflicted land, he was perhaps not aware that both my reverend brother Mr. Page and myself have spent the best part of our lives in the very heart of that country; and that therefore, while our souls can mourn over the spiritual bondage in which the people are lying, we are able to testify, from personal knowledge, to many of the facts which have occurred in that distracted country. The reverend gentleman seemed to deny my statement at the last meeting, that a man had been murdered in open day—a victim to the spirit of religious persecution. I was myself the curate of the parish at the time. The man was a Roman Catholic school-master, named O'Connor; he had declared his intention of becoming a Protestant; and on the sabbath day—when every passion should have been subdued in its hallowed hours—at the hour of twelve, (the hour at which we assemble for worship in Ireland,) as he was on his way to the parish church in

order to renounce his Romanism and declare his avowal of Protestantism, on the king's high road he was seized and left a murdered and mangled corpse before the face of heaven and in the eyes of his country. This occurred in my own parish; it occurred among my own people. And the priest went to the fatal scene, and, having found on the person of the murdered victim some tracts, a copy of "Andrew Dunn," and the New Testament, he held them up in the presence of the multitude, and stated that this man's murder was a judgment from heaven for having such heretical books in his possession!

But the reverend gentleman seemed inclined to doubt another illustration of the spirit of persecution on the part of the Romish priests—as alluded to by my friend, Mr. Page.

In reference therefore to it, I would state that it is the simple fact, that the Rev. James Hughes, a priest of Newport, when a scripture reader was assaulted and beaten by the people at his suggestion, and the case came before the magistrates, openly avowed that from the altar of his chapel he had desired his people, if they could not get rid of the Protestants in any other way, to "pelt them with stones, hunt them with pitchforks, and drown them in bog-holes." Such was his own avowal before the magistrates! But "in what madhouse is that priest detained?"—asks the Rev. Joseph Sidden!—and he tells the meeting, that he "will write to his Bishop without delay" to inform him of the fact!—Why, sir, the Bishop of that priest is neither more nor less than the Most Rev. John McHale, the Popish Archbishop at Tuam; whose gentle method of confining this persecuting priest in a "madhouse" was promoting him forthwith to the richest parish in his diocese!

I shall mention one more similar fact, and have done with this part of the subject. I resided for a short time with a clergyman in the West of Ireland—a relation of my own. This gentleman had two

daughters, who were in the habit of visiting the poor cottagers in the neighbourhood, and conversing with them on religious subjects. When the priest ascertained this, he gave public intimation that on the following Sunday he would have something to say respecting those two young ladies. Having heard of this intimation, I went to the chapel with their brother on the day in question. The priest stood at the altar, and told the people, that he was aware there were two young ladies visiting them at their cottages; "now, my good people," said he, "I will tell you what to do with them; you must turn them out of your houses, and, if they attempt to enter them again, throw at them the dirtiest thing you have in your cabins; and if that does not frighten them away, I will tell you what you must do—'every man's house is his castle,' let every man of you take your *pitchfork* and stand at the door of your house, and, *if any thing happens, I will be answerable for that.*" This occurred in my own presence; and with it I dismiss this part of the subject, simply adding, that I speak it from personal experience, that no man can conceive the unwearied, the untiring system of persecution, to which the poor Protestants of Ireland are exposed, through the influence of the Priests; they are insulted, mocked, beaten, way-laid, pelted with stones, and often hunted through the country—the mothers injured, the daughters insulted, the children beaten, and every species of wrong and contumely done to them, which suffering men can bear or which wicked men can perpetrate.

And now, sir, I shall turn to another topic, which occupied much of the time of the reverend gentleman. He alluded to the subject of the scriptures, and he entered, for one hour, into an elaborate vindication of the Church of Rome, asserting that she did not withhold the scriptures from the people. He stated

that the Catholic people (he means *the Romish people*,) are in the habit of reading the scriptures. Sir, I know for a fact, that many of them are in the habit of reading the scriptures; and I know likewise for a fact, that they do it *by stealth*. I know that the Roman Catholic Bishops have directed (as the reverend gentleman has stated) that, if bibles or testaments are given to the people, they shall return them to those who gave them, while they are at once to destroy every other book. It is accordingly the habit in Ireland for the priest to demand the scriptures from the people, and they are frequently surrendered to them; but what the priests then do with the bibles and testaments is the question that determines their veneration for the sacred volume. I will state a fact. In the parish of Ballinasloe, there was a Roman Catholic priest, who visited the schools established by the late Lord Clancarty on his estates, and, having gone through all the schools, he collected all the bibles and testaments he could find; and with a view of having a sort of public display—a little *auto da fe*, in his own fashion—he deposited them in a bag, and, in the presence of a large concourse of persons, he went to the bridge, in the centre of the town of Ballinasloe, and emptied his bag of bibles and testaments into the river! And this is just the result, the illustration of the rule, which the reverend gentleman has stated as a proof of priestly veneration for the scriptures of God—that the people are not to destroy their bibles, but are to deliver them up either to those that gave them, or to the Catholic priests!

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN—You should say, the Protestant bible, not the Catholic. We think yours erroneous, and therefore they are not allowed the use of it; but they are allowed the use of the Catholic bible.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR—I answer, that they are *not* allowed the use of even what he calls the Catholic bible.

A PERSON *in the body of the Hall*.—I am a Catholic, and I am allowed it.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—I am happy to hear it: but it is only because you live in a land of Protestantism, where they cannot withhold it from you.

REV. MR. COLE.—I believe that it is Mr. Collins, who has just spoken; he has, on the other hand, often been heard to say, that the bible is not a fit book for people to read.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—There is no authorized "Catholic" version of the bible at all; there is no such book in existence, as *an authorized English Bible for Roman Catholics*. Will the reverend gentleman tell the meeting, where I can find an English translation authorized by the Church of Rome—not *by individuals*, but *authorized by the Church*? he is fond of that nice distinction, and I pray him to observe it in his answer.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—The one by Martini.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—Martini's is an *Italian*, and not an *English* version, published (if my memory be correct) in twenty-three folio volumes! An Italian bible of twenty-three folio volumes would be of marvellous use in instructing the poor peasantry of Ireland. Can the reverend gentleman name any *English* version, that was *authorized by his Church*?

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—I mistook your meaning; I have an English version here; Pope Pius the Seventh recommended the Catholic Bishops to cause their people to read this.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—The reverend gentleman has it not either here or at home. *It is not in existence.* The facts are these; and Mr. Sidden will not contradict me. The Council of Trent declared that there was to be one authentic bible; and that was to be, not the original, but that which was called the Latin Vulgate; they appointed a committee, in order to revise that Vulgate and correct it. That Vulgate, thus revised and corrected, did not come out, till some

twenty or thirty years after the Council was dissolved. The first English translation of the bible for Roman Catholics was made by some priests of the Jesuit Order at Rheims and Douay, *before that authorized or authentic Vulgate was published!* This Vulgate was published, I think, in the year 1592; and you will find that the Rhemish testament was published some years before the completion of this, which was to be the only "authentic" bible!

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—The Vulgate bible was published in the lifetime of St. Jerome, at least fourteen hundred years ago.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—What is called the Vulgate bible has been so called very naturally, but very ignorantly. There was an old Latin bible used in the primitive church, which was called *the Vulgate*; it was found, that, as this was translated by some one, who did not sufficiently understand Hebrew, the old testament scriptures were badly translated; it was proposed therefore, by St. Jerome, who understood Hebrew well, to bring out another translation; he accordingly did so; but it was soon ascertained, that some parts of the old version were better than the new, and some parts of the new better than the old, so they dove-tailed the two translations: they adopted the Psalms from the old one, and the Prophets from the new one, and they thus compiled a complete Latin translation, which has since then been generally called *The Vulgate*. Now this version continued in use in the Church of Rome, till the sitting of the Council of Trent; and that Council declared that a large number of errors had crept into all the editions of that bible, and they appointed certain learned men to examine and correct it—declaring *beforehand* that it was authentic, or in other words infallible. But before it was published—before this authorized edition was published—our English translation was published in this country, and then the Roman Catholics were obliged to bring out a translation of their own, and

were compelled to translate one of the *discarded* editions; and thus the Roman Catholic version circulated in this country is a translation of some Latin bible, that was declared *non-authentic and rejected as such by the Council of Trent!*

This is the real history of the English version, which is now in use among the Romanists of this country, and which Mr. Sidden calls "the Catholic bible." It is a version never authorized by a Pope—never sanctioned by a Council—never approved by any authority whatever in the church of Rome. It is essentially a private and unauthorized version. It undergoes new changes with every new edition; and this is carried so far, that you can scarcely procure the same translation unless you can procure the same edition.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—The Council of Trent expressly said, that that Latin bible might be used as authentic, but that they did not mean to prevent the original Hebrew and Greek from being consulted, and the Latin text made more and more perfect in proportion as more and more manuscripts were discovered, and the various readings compared by the most judicious critics.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—What the gentleman states respecting the *Latin* bible is perfectly correct; but he forgot to state also, that they declared it was authentic and correct before ever it was published—before it was even made—before ever they saw it!

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—That it might be used *as if it were authentic*.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—Before ever they saw it or knew whether it was really correct or not!

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—That a Latin translation of the bible was to be made and gradually brought towards perfection—perhaps during the whole existence of the church. If more correct manuscripts of the original Hebrew and Greek should be discovered from time to time, would it not be right that the translations, made perhaps from incorrect manuscripts in ancient times,

should be reformed? Certainly. Even by order of King George the III., a very learned Protestant critic (I think, Dr. Kennicott,) compared the different manuscripts, and found, I think, some thousands of discrepancies. And the Catholic Church acts on the same principle; as fast as she can discover more correct manuscripts, she introduces corrections into the printed scriptures. She would be a very unfaithful guide to men, if she did not.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—Let it be observed that the reverend gentleman is still dealing with his *Latin*—not the *English*—version. The Church of Rome having declared that this Latin version was to be used “as if it were authentic” before ever it was corrected, we can well judge of the nature of the infallibility of the Fathers of the Council. But the reverend gentleman has not yet ventured a word respecting the *English* version of his Church. This English version has been made by anonymous individuals—it has never been authorized by any Pope—it has never been authorized by any Council—it has never been authorized by any assembly of Bishops in the Romish Church; and yet—though he knows it to be utterly unauthorized—he calls it *the Catholic bible*.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—Because it is used by Catholics.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—*That* certainly is a novel meaning of the word; it is Catholic, merely *because used by Catholics!*

But, sir, having thus shewn that they have no *authorized version in the English language*, we will proceed with our subject. I have stated, that the Church of Rome, as a church, is opposed to the circulation of the scriptures. The Church of Rome passed a decree in the Council of Toulouse on this subject.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—No, not the Church of Rome; only the Council of Toulouse.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—We shall not differ about words; it was passed by an assembly of *the*

Bishops of the Church of Rome at Toulouse; it was held under Pope Gregory IV. In the fourteenth canon then enacted, there are the following words—“We prohibit the laity having the books of the Old or New Testament, unless any one should wish from a feeling of devotion to have a Psalter or Breviary for divine service or the hours of the blessed Virgin Mary; but we strictly forbid them to have the above-mentioned books in the vulgar tongue.” They may have the scriptures in *Latin*, they may have them in the original *Hebrew* and *Greek*, they may have them in any language except the vulgar or *vernacular tongue*! And why?

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—Because of the Albigenses.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—“Because of the Albigenses,” was just the right answer! This decree was passed, like many decrees of the Church of Rome, against the Protestants of that day, the Albigenses, who, having been familiar with the holy scriptures, had always denied the doctrines of the Church of Rome, and who were therefore, according to the principles of that Church, to be persecuted and exterminated. As it was discovered that they thus protested against the errors of the Church of Rome because they loved the reading of the scriptures, therefore the Council commenced by passing this enactment, that the laity should not be permitted to read the scriptures of the Old or the New Testament.

Now, sir, this principle was carried on, even to the time of the Council of Trent. That Council appointed a Committee, with authority to compile and prepare rules respecting the scriptures and other books; they compiled those regulations in the strongest terms that can be commanded. I have now before me those rules of the Index; they are the rules of the Church of Rome, which have been arranged with the view of preventing the holy scriptures being generally read by the people. Those rules are published, as the reverend gentleman has acknowledged, even in his own copy of the canons of the Council of Trent.

The fourth of these rules is as follows—

“Since it is manifest by experience, that, if the holy Bible in the vernacular language be permitted everywhere indiscriminately, *there will arise more harm than good* on account of the rashness of man, therefore let the advice of the Bishop or Inquisition be abided by in this matter, so that, with the advice of the parish priest or confessor, they may allow the reading of the Bible in the vernacular tongue, translated by Catholic authors, to those persons, who, they think, cannot receive injury but rather increase of faith and piety by such reading, WHICH PERMISSION THEY MUST HAVE IN WRITING. *But if any one shall presume either to read or to possess them without such a permission, HE SHALL NOT RECEIVE THE ABSOLUTION OF HIS SINS, unless he shall deliver up the Bible to his bishop. Let booksellers also—who may have sold Bibles in the vernacular language to persons who do not possess this permission, or who may have given them away in any manner—be fined (pretium amittant) in the value of the books, which fine is to be appropriated to pious uses at the pleasure of the bishop. But the regular clergy [i. e. monks and friars] must not either READ them or BUY them, unless they get a faculty from their prelates.*”

This is the formal rule of the Church of Rome respecting the circulation of the scriptures; and when at our last meeting this rule was read to the reverend gentleman, he replied by stating that he was not bound by that rule and, holding up to the view of the meeting his copy of the decrees of the Council of Trent, he told the assembly that he was bound only by the contents of that volume; we immediately referred him to that portion of the volume, which we knew always contained this prohibitory rule; he accordingly did refer to it, and, apparently much to his own astonishment, and certainly very much to the astonishment of the meeting, the very words that I had quoted—the very rules that I had cited—were found in his copy, to

which he acknowledged himself committed; and then finding himself thus involved, he made the marvellous discovery, that all these rules had been compiled—not by the Council, but by a committee of that Council; the gentleman seeming to forget, that every other canon of the Church of Rome passed in that Council was first drawn up by one of these committees, in precisely the same manner as those rules respecting the prohibited books in general and the scriptures in particular.

That rule of index, prohibiting the circulation of the scriptures, has ranked among the records of the Roman Church from that day to this hour; and the encyclical letter of the present Pope expressly alludes to those rules of the Index, and desires that they shall be observed. I hold in my hand the Roman Catholic *Laity's Directory*, which contains the encyclical letter of the Pope; and he states in it, that “the subject engaged the closest attention of the Fathers of the Council of Trent, and as a remedy they passed that most salutary decree for forming an Index of works in which depraved doctrine was contained.” Such are the words of the present Pope, affirming the authority of this Index of prohibited books, and among these prohibited books they have inserted *the bible* as a book to be prohibited to the laity; and thus the Pope himself not only quotes the Index, but states that it was enacted by the Fathers of the Council. And the reverend gentleman himself, in a letter of his own, published in this town of Guildford, has distinctly stated as a fact that the rules of the Index were passed by what he calls “the Catholic Church.” The attention of the last meeting was called to this rule; and those who were present on that occasion will never forget the result, to which it led. The gentleman declared then, that “the Catholic Church” did *not* pass the rules of the Index; and in reply I produced at that meeting his own pamphlet, published in this town and addressed to the Protestants of Guildford, in which he writes distinctly that “the Catholic Church” *did*

enact them. His words in his pamphlet were, that his object was "to lay before the people the translations of the holy scriptures, put forth by the divines of *the Catholic Church*, before such a thing as a Protestant bible was ever heard of; they would then see, that that Church, instead of being opposed to the circulation of the scriptures, has even shewn an anxiety to let the word of God have free course and be glorified, and though, from a praiseworthy motive, endeavouring to save the sacred oracles from pollution at a time when a wild fanaticism founded on a perversion of scripture seemed to threaten the dissolution of the social system, she" (that is, "*the Catholic Church*" as he calls it) "passed a temporary law for regulating the use of the inspired writings"—so that his own pamphlet sets forth deliberately that his Church did pass that enactment, though he appears before you this day to declare that it did *not* enact it. But he stated further in his pamphlet, that "*the Catholic Church*" (as he calls the Church of Rome) has now "*reverted to her original discipline*"—has in fact rescinded or repealed the rules of the Index prohibiting the scriptures. This assertion he also made at the last meeting; and I called upon him in the presence of the assembly, to state *when* the Church of Rome repealed them—*where* the Church of Rome repealed them—*by what authority* in the Church of Rome were they repealed; and the reverend gentleman was unable to make an effort to vindicate himself from the charge of publishing a statement before the Protestants of Guildford—a statement that is not only without the faintest shadow of a foundation, but that he knew, and must have *known* while he indited it, possessed not the least shadow of foundation in the truth of history. But so contradictory are his statements, that on the last day he stated that the rule had been thus rescinded or repealed, and he states here to-day that *it never was enacted!* In his pamphlet, he tells you that *the Church passed it*—in his speech at the

last meeting, that *the Church repealed it*—and now to-day, that *the Church never passed it*, and yet that *the Church has repealed it!*—(Mr. Sidden here intimated his dissent, in a mode not observed by Mr. Seymour.)

And now, sir, I shall pass on to another subject, on which the reverend gentleman dilated at considerable length, namely, the invocation of saints and prayer to the Virgin.

I shall not follow him through all his statements, as I think it unnecessary and as it would occupy more of your time than I desire or deserve; but I shall refer to the charge, which at the former meeting I advanced against the Church of Rome, namely—that in the books and tracts, which she is at present circulating among the Roman Catholic population of this country, there is the most hideous and deformed idolatry inculcated upon the minds of the people. I produced several of those books before the meeting and read passages from them, in order that the meeting might judge for themselves as to the truth of my accusation. I shall follow the same course on the present occasion; and then the meeting will judge—each individual for himself—whether my charge can be sustained, or whether the reverend gentleman has sufficiently answered it.

In a book—entitled “The Glories of Mary”—which has been lately published in this country, and has gone through (so great has been its circulation) three editions within the last few years, there are two passages to which I called attention at the last meeting; I will read them again.

“That all is subject to Mary’s empire, even God himself, St. Bernard of Sienna does not fear to advance. The saint wishes to insinuate thereby, that God hears Mary’s prayers *as if they were commands*. The Lord, O Mary, (says St. Anselm,) has so exalted you, that his favour has rendered you *omnipotent*, Yes, says Richard of St. Lawrence, *Mary is omnipotent*, for according to all laws the queen enjoys the

same privileges as the king and that power may be *equal between the Son and his Mother*. Jesus has rendered Mary *omnipotent*; the one is *omnipotent by nature*, the other is *omnipotent by grace*."

Now, sir, I shall not pause to dwell upon this awful passage, which proclaims the Virgin Mary as having *equal honour* with Jesus Christ, and exalts her as having *equal power* with him, the only difference being that one is *omnipotent by grace* and the other is *omnipotent by nature*! If this be not blasphemy, I know of no term in the English language by which to designate it. But, sir, they go further than this; and here we read from the same work as follows—"In the chronicles of St. Francis we read that brother Leo saw in a vision two ladders, one red on the top of which was Jesus Christ, and the other white at the top of which presided his blessed mother." (We Protestants, who read the scriptures, find but one way to heaven, namely, Him who said, "I am the way; no man cometh unto the Father but by me;" but *they* have discovered two.) "He observed that many, who endeavoured to ascend the first ladder, after mounting a few steps fell down, and on trying again were equally unsuccessful, so that they never attained the summit;" (thus they, that attempted to enter heaven by Jesus Christ, were unsuccessful and never attained it;) "but a voice having told them to make trial of the white ladder, they soon gained the top, the blessed Virgin having held forth her hand to help them." Thus you will fail of entering heaven, if you go by Jesus Christ; but you are sure of attaining it, if you go by the Virgin Mary! If that be not idolatrous, I know not what idolatry is.

The prayer, with which the book concludes, is addressed to Jesus and to Mary alike, and places them on an equality as objects of prayer. "O Jesus! O Mary! may your names live in my heart and the heart of all men! may I forget all other names, in order to remember your admirable names alone! O Jesus,

my redeemer! O Mary, my mother! when my last hour shall come, when my soul shall be on the eve of its departure from this world, grant I beseech you that my last words may be, Jesus! Mary! I love you. Amen." Alas! they would go down to "the lake that burneth" with a lie in their right hand.

But, sir, I shall be told that this is some unauthorised publication. I answer, it was written by one who enjoys the dubious honour of being the last saint, who has been canonized in the Church of Rome. It was written by Alphonsus Siquori, who has been quoted this day, if I heard aright, by Mr. Sidden himself; and who was placed in the canon of saints in the year 1830, only eight years ago; and in the Papal brief, which canonized him, it is distinctly stated that *there is no error in his writings*. And thus the Pope, "the centre of Catholic unity," (as the reverend gentleman styles him,) has given his *imprimatur* to all these blasphemous and hideous idolatries.

But if he demands still further authority as to this practice—if he requires to have his Church still further implicated in it—I refer him to his own "holy office," which he reads for an hour and a half every day. "Besides this," says the Rev. Joseph Sidden in his pamphlet, "every day of my life, I, like all Catholic clergymen in holy orders, am required by the Church to spend an hour and a half, sometimes two hours, in reading the divine office, which chiefly consists of passages from the holy scriptures;" these are the words of the reverend gentleman himself, in which he admits, that, in reading "the holy office," he is required to spend an hour and a half every day of his life. He says, it chiefly consists of scripture; sir, it does consist of a large portion of the holy scriptures; but it does likewise consist of a large portion of the most absurd legendary fictions. They have bound up their untrue legends with the word of the living God; like the tyrant of old, they have bound the living with the dead, that the living might perish

with the dead ! That the meeting may judge of the spirit of this "holy office" as he calls it, I will read one of those many prayers, which the Rev Joseph Sidden informs us he is in the habit of reading an hour and a half every day of his life. In this book there is the following direction respecting prayer to the Virgin Mary ; I know of few more beautiful in their composition, but I know of none more awful in their language. It first speaks of Mary as being "the star arising out of Jacob," and it then continues as follows :

"O thou, who art floating on the ocean of this world amongst storms and tempests, rather than walking on the earth ! turn not away thine eyes from the brightness of the star, if thou wouldest not be overwhelmed by the star. - If the winds of temptation arise, if thou run not upon the rocks of tribulation, look to the star, *call upon Mary*. If thou art tossed upon the waves of pride and of distraction, if of envy, look to the star, *call upon Mary*. If anger or avarice or the temptation of the flesh shall toss the bark of thy mind, *look to Mary*. If disturbed with the greatness of thy sins, troubled with the defilement of thy conscience, affrighted by the horrors of judgment, thou beginnest to be swallowed up in the gulf of sadness and abyss of despair, *think upon Mary*.—In dangers, in straits, in perplexities, think upon Mary, invoke Mary. Let her not depart from thy heart, and, that thou mayest attain to the suffrage of her prayer, desert not the example of her conversation, &c."

Here is one of those "Divine offices," which the reverend gentleman tells us he must himself read for an hour and a half or two hours every day of his life ! I appeal to a christian people—Is not this applying to the Virgin Mary for those very graces, that very protection, those very blessings, which can only be asked of God without peril of the grossest idolatry, and for which every child of God comes continually to ask from the Lord Jesus Christ, as the "one Mediator between God and man ?"

But the reverend gentleman admitted, that there was some allusion to the Virgin Mary in the last encyclical letter of the Pope; and I confess, sir, I was anxious he should read it to the meeting. I called upon him at the moment to read it; but it appears, that the gentleman, not speaking extemporaneously, and therefore unable to depart from his manuscript, could not comply with my request, and therefore I must myself read to the meeting the words of the Pope, as they occur in his encyclical letter. The words are—“That all may have a successful and happy issue, let us raise our eyes to the most blessed Virgin Mary, *who alone destroys heresies*, who is *our greatest hope*, yea, *the entire ground of our hope*.” Oh! sir, she may be “the greatest hope” of his holiness at Rome, she may perhaps (for he spoke with a “perhaps”) be the only and “entire ground of hope” to my reverend opponent; but I do trust—I do pray—that there may not be one soul in this vast assembly, so careless of his salvation here and his glory hereafter, as to ground his hope, one atom of his hope of heaven, upon such a foundation as the Virgin Mary. Lay all your hope upon Jesus Christ, lay all your hope upon the “Rock of Ages,” and then he will prove the Rock of the christian and the Rock of the Church. The world with its temptations may rage around you; the world with all its billows and all its storms may break against the rock, upon which the Believer stands; they may dash their surges over it and seem to shake it for a time; but that rock—even without an effort—will fling them all aside, and will still lift its head unmoved amidst the storm, unshaken amidst the waves, and, like the everlasting hills, it standeth fast for ever!

And now, sir, dismissing this portion of our subject, I pass on to another. The reverend gentleman stated, that the Nicene Creed (that is, the Creed of the Council of Nice,) was adopted by the Council of Ephesus; and he gave us a great variety of particulars as to dates,

and unimportant matters, which I pass by, and then affected to give the decree of the Council of Ephesus. He stated to you that he would recite the decree, and he actually commenced the reading of it, and then he unexpectedly stopped; when he stopped, I called upon him to proceed and finish it, and the answer he gave was that he had it not with him, although he had previously stated he had it here and although he had actually read a portion of it at the time. It is therefore necessary that I should read it to the meeting; and I may observe in doing so, that it is a painful feature in this controversy that we, who are opposing the Romish Priests, are obliged to bring authorities for every thing we state, as otherwise we are sure to be contradicted, or certain of hearing the most distinct misstatements from our adversaries.

The gentleman stated to you, that the decree of the Council of Ephesus merely was that men should not make any other profession of faith; the words he used were—"that no one should be allowed or should dare to make any profession of faith, other than the Nicene Creed without any addition." Now I will read the whole canon; that the meeting may judge of the true reason for which Mr. Sidden declined to read it.

"That no one shall be allowed to set forth or write or compose any other creed, but that defined by the holy Fathers who assembled under the influence of the Holy Ghost at Nice; and whosoever shall dare either to compose any other formulary of faith or to set it forth or to offer it to converts, whether from the Gentiles or Jews, or from any heresy, to inform them of the truth—if they are bishops, they shall be put out of their episcopal office—if laymen, they shall be subjected to an anathema."

There is the canon; the meeting will perceive, that, by the decree of the Council of Ephesus, the Nicene Creed, which forms a part of your Communion Service, was to be the only creed—that no man afterwards should dare to compose another—that he had no right

to add one article to those contained in that creed. But the reverend gentleman admits, that, in contravention of that decree, the bishops at Trent compiled another creed—or rather that the Pope at that time compiled a new creed; and the reverend gentleman has favoured us with all the particular articles in that new creed. Therefore the point of the argument between us, respecting the creeds, is this—that the creed of the Church of England was published at the Council of Nice, 325 years after the birth of Christ, and that the creed of the Church of Rome was not compiled till many years even after Luther's reformation! This the gentleman will not contradict.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—I totally contradict it, every syllable of it; there is not the least truth in it.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—Will the reverend gentleman specify the dates? This will at once determine the point.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—What date? You have said that I professed to read the decree of the Council of Ephesus; I never professed to read it, I only read what I had translated.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—Well, will you be so kind as to specify what was the date of the publication of Pope Pius's creed, which you have this day read to the meeting?

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—It was published in 1564.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—Precisely so; and Luther's reformation commenced in 1517!

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—What of that?

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—What I stated was that the creed of the Church of England was compiled in the Primitive Church at the Council of Nice, and that the creed of the Church of Rome was not drawn up and published till the Council of Trent—many years after the reformation. The reverend gentleman contradicted this statement, and now, when we come to specific dates, he is obliged to admit that the creed of his Church was not compiled till long after

the bones of Martin Luther had been mouldering in his grave!

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—The doctrines in it were not though; the doctrines are as old as the days of Jesus Christ, but the words of the Pope are not so old.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—We can very easily enter upon that question, and show whether of the twain churches is the oldest in its doctrines; but the meeting will perceive, that it is now admitted by Mr. Sidden that my statement was correct, namely, that the creed of his Church was not compiled till after the reformation.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—That particular profession of our faith—a profession of that faith, that is eighteen hundred years old, as I can show you by the same evidence by which you can prove the Trinity.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—But it appears that these doctrines—these new articles of Trent—were wholly undiscovered by the Fathers of the Council of Nice. They never alluded to them. They were utterly unknown to them. He admits that the Council of Nice compiled a creed—that this creed was received by the Council of Ephesus—that we have that creed in the Church of England in our Communion Service—

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—Certainly, and I am very happy that you have.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—And he admits still further, that Pope Pius in 1564 *added* twelve new articles of his own to that ancient and primitive creed of the Church.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—Placed after that creed twelve articles of doctrine, as old as the articles of doctrine in the Nicene creed.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—But they were so unknown to the Council of Nice that they would not insert them in the creed, and so unknown to the Council of Ephesus that they not only would not insert them, but prohibited any one else inserting them.

under the penalties of an anathema ; and yet Mr. Sidden admits that the Pope has so inserted them in his new creed.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—Nobody contradicted these articles at the time of the Council of Ephesus ; but when they *were* contradicted, in the sixteenth century, the Pope drew up this profession of them. I can show you them in the words of saints, that lived before the Council of Ephesus ; and you know it.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—I really *do* know, not exactly what the reverend gentleman has stated, but exactly the reverse, namely, that all these new articles are essentially novelties, and were utterly unknown in the Primitive Church, and that they were not admitted into the creeds of the Primitive Church—not because they were uncontradicted, but because they were contrary to the ancient faith of the Church of Christ.

But, sir, I would now say a few words about the monks ; and I hope the meeting will excuse the irregularity, as to arrangement, of a purely extemporaneous address. The monks, to whom I alluded at the last meeting, were charged by me with being the Trappists from Melleray, in Normandy, and I stated that that monastery at St. Bernard—

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—Which is in Brittany.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—Well, we will not quarrel about trifles ; the departments join each other ; at all events it was in France.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—I mention it only to shew that your memory fails you.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—At all events it was in France, whether in Brittany or Normandy is of little importance ; and the reverend gentleman assures us that he visited it, and found the monks eating and drinking like other folk, but then it was only small beer and weak cider and vegetables. Now these monks, these godly pious monks, who, if we believe

the praises of the reverend gentleman, never did any thing that was wrong—who never did so naughty a thing as even to write a letter to a relative or friend—who never did any thing except make the most profound salaams to visitors, and spent their days in chaunting *Ave Marias*—these monks, by some untoward event, were discovered by the French government plotting treason against the State! The French government detected them, and ascertained that they were in correspondence (though they never write to any of their friends in the wide world, if we believe Mr. Sidden!)—they were in correspondence with the exiled Charles the 10th. and the Duchess de Berri and his family, for the purpose of effecting a counter-revolution in France. When the government detected these pious monks at this work in the darkness and secrecy of the cells of their monastery, they acted with decision; they said, “We have found you out at last; we will not excuse you, as your treason deserves, but we give you a ship and you may emigrate abroad, and you shall never enter France again.” I think this was great clemency to men guilty of such treason to the government. These monks were perfectly well known to be rebels; and when their vessel entered among the channel islands, the population knew that they were rebels to their own Popish government of France, and concluded that they could not be very loyal subjects of the Protestant king of England, and they sent a memorial to this country, stating that they had been hitherto steady to the crown and loyal to the throne, and they trusted that the British government would not permit them to be inundated with a swarm of monks, who might endeavour to sow treason among them, as having been found guilty of treason in their own country.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—A noble lord told me the other day, that the French monks were still at their monastery.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—They proceeded on

their voyage from the channel islands, and part of them landed in Ireland, and (as the gentleman has stated) were received by Sir Richard Keane, and the remainder (as the gentleman also stated) were received in Leicestershire by Ambrose Lisle Philipps, Esq.; I have seen their monastery there, and speak from personal knowledge.

Now, sir, I stated at the last meeting, that certain monks were going about this country raising money under false pretences. I said then, that the object they professed was to take souls out of purgatory, if only you would give them money to whet their charity to the suffering souls; and as I call the pretence of taking suffering souls out of purgatory a false pretence, so I denounced the procedure as a raising money under false pretences.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—No such thing. The Protestant Earl of Carlisle gave them a subscription the other day to build their monastery; it is *not built* yet.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—I do not charge these men without evidence; I hold in my hand their own begging letter, and I hold also the letter of four Roman Catholic bishops respecting them. But I commence this part of my subject with the letter of Dr. Baines, the Roman bishop at Bath. In that letter he proposes to re-build the establishment at Prior Park, near Bath; and he states, that the names of subscribers of £10. or upwards shall be inscribed on marble tablets in the sacristy of the new college for daily commemoration at the altar, (that is, for a mass every day,) and a weekly mass to be offered for benefactors in general, (that is, they shall be entitled to only one mass a week); so that if you give £10. towards this establishment, you will become entitled to a mass every day, that is, *seven* masses a week, but, if you give less than £10., you shall be entitled to only *one* mass a week. Now as the Council of Trent has stated (and as the gentleman admits) that the saying of masses takes souls out of purgatory or lessens their

pains in it, so, by your subscribing £10. towards this monastic establishment, you will be taken out of Purgatory or have your tortures lessened in it seven times as soon as a man that subscribes a lesser amount! Now as I conceive that the raising money at all, under the pretence of taking souls out of an imaginary purgatory, is raising money under false pretences, so I must state that the men, who are wandering and begging about the country for this object, are raising money under false pretences.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN—Horrible! horrible!

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR—And as I believe the law of England states that a man raising money under false pretences is a swindler, so I say that these men are nothing better than cowed and hooded and consecrated swindlers!

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN—What have Dr. Baines and Prior Park to do with these monks in Leicestershire?

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR—I will go from one to the other, and, having begun with the priestcraft at Bath, I shall end with the priestcraft in Leicestershire. This document, which I now hold in my hand, is signed by Bishop Baines, Bishop Bramston, Bishop Walsh, and Bishop Briggs—all Roman Catholic Bishops in this country; and some of these bishops have sanctioned the begging expedition of these monks from Leicestershire; and some of the Irish Roman Catholic Bishops have authorized the Irish monks to go forth on a similar expedition. The objects, for which they are raising money, are set forth under a variety of particulars:—“We celebrate every day a holy mass for our benefactors, and a memento is made for them at every private mass; we pray for them at the midnight office, and at the canonical hours of the day; the community make a *general communion for them on the first Thursday of every month*,;” (only think, of a monk receiving the communion for you! *that* is what I have called receiving the communion “by proxy;”) “we celebrate every Friday the holy

office for the deceased benefactors"—or, in other words, they say masses, to take their souls out of purgatory.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN—Oh! no.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR—For what, then?

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN—To relieve their sufferings through Jesus Christ, if God is pleased to grant it through Jesus Christ, just as you pray for the queen.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR—It is a matter of indifference, whether they pretend to *take them out of purgatory*, or pretend to *relieve their sufferings in it*. All that I say is that these monks are raising money under the pretence of saying masses to get souls out of purgatory—or to relieve their sufferings in it, if he prefers the phrase. They continue to say—"They are prayed for, when we are informed of their illness, and a *De profundis* is recited every afternoon for the deceased benefactors." The reverend gentleman can inform the meeting, that the *De profundis* is a part of the mass, which is said for the souls of the dead in purgatory.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN—It is no part of the mass book; it is out of the Psalms.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR—It is, as every one knows, the beginning of the Psalm, which we translate, "Out of the depths have I cried unto thee, O Lord." In masses for the dead, they always recite that psalm in reference to the dead, as if they were crying out in the agonies of purgatory; and, as they express it here, "for *deceased benefactors*."

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN—Sometimes; not in the Mass.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR—Well, let it be *sometimes*, though he before denied its being any part of the office for the dead. I have read seven clauses of this document; now the eighth and last is—"Every special benefactor shall be associated to the prayers and *good works* of the whole society;" that is, they shall have a share in the good works of the society, and *that looks very like doing good works by proxy!* These

are the propositions of the monks themselves; and the Popish Bishops conclude by saying, "Deeply impressed with the merits of the monks of La Trappe, &c.—we most earnestly recommend them to the attention of the faithful of these dioceses, and to the particular patronage of the Clergy." And so it ends with the signature of six bishops.

Now, sir, I think I have substantiated my charge against the monks. They are raising money to take souls out of purgatory, or, as Mr. Sidden expresses it, to lessen the sufferings of souls in purgatory; and they are professing to enable the benefactors of this monastery to *do good works, to say prayers, and to receive the communion*, by proxy!

I shall dismiss this part of the subject with but one observation more. The reverend gentleman has taken pains to inform the meeting, that a monk means a person, who observes the counsels of Christ as well as his express commandments, and who strives to follow the gospel in perfection; and he tells you, that these "holy" men ought not to be married; and he cited certain scriptures to justify a state of celibacy. Now I shall just quote three passages from the bible upon this subject, if the meeting will bear with me a moment. The gentleman feels, as I feel, that the orders of the church are three—bishops, priests, and deacons; and I shall read what St. Paul writes of these three orders, that you may judge for yourselves whether he contemplates these living in the celibacy of a monkish life.—1 Tim. 3. 1: "This is a true saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work. A bishop then must be blameless, *the husband of one wife*, ruling well his own house, *having his children in subjection* with all gravity." That is not living like a monk.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN—It means a man who has been married only once. He may be a Bishop.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR—The next order is priests; I will read according to the Roman Catholic

version of the word Elders; "I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst ordain priests in every city; if any be blameless, *the husband of one wife, having faithful children*, not accused of riot, nor unruly;" this is the description of priests. And then, in reference to deacons, the first epistle to Timothy states—"Let the deacons be grave;—even so must their *wives* be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things. Let the deacons be the *husbands* of one *wife*, *ruling their children* and their own houses well." 1 Tim. 3. 12. You perceive, the apostle states that bishops may be husbands, that priests may be husbands, and that deacons may be husbands, and directs that their wives shall be grave and their children well instructed; he places no positive injunction on them to marry, but it is quite clear that he gives them full permission to marry, and gives not the slightest intimation—nor would our experience of human nature, nor our knowledge of monasteries warrant an intimation—that they would lead better or holier lives, by turning monks in a monastery.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN—Will you allow me to interrupt?

THE CHAIRMAN—No; Mr. Seymour had better proceed.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR—Sir, the last point, to which I shall call the attention of the meeting, is the Breviary. We have already seen, that the gentleman recites it, and is bound to read in it every day of his life. I hold in my hand his pamphlet, and he distinctly states, when he wants to magnify his reading and show how much he reads—"I am required to spend *an hour and a half* and *sometimes two hours* in saying the divine office, every day of my life;" but in his statement this day, when, being charged with its absurdities. he wants to show how little he reads of it, he assures us it occupies only *an hour and a quarter*.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN—That is the office for the day; on an average it is not more through the year.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR—Oh! Mr. Chairman, it is painful that any man upon a solemn subject should, merely to serve a purpose, be thus doing and undoing, saying and un-saying, saying one thing in a pamphlet and another thing in a speech.

But now, sir, I shall call attention to this Breviary, which he reads, according to one statement, *two hours*, according to another statement *an hour and a half*, and according to a third statement *an hour and a quarter*—the statement being always such as best suits his argument. He states, that at the last meeting I read some histories out of this Breviary; and he admits that some of these narratives in his Breviary are very far from being true; and he tries to get over them by saying, that, if collected, they would form but one page of the volume! Sir, I have some little knowledge of the Breviary; it consists of four volumes, and I will state that a very large portion of it is full of these strange, absurd, and fabulous narrations; and I could keep this meeting in one roar of laughter at their legendary absurdities for some hours, were I so disposed to desecrate the present occasion. But as the reverend gentleman has adverted to them, I must illustrate their nature; and the meeting will be able to judge for themselves of the tendency of such narratives.

The reverend gentleman commenced by stating that I had, on the last day, referred to some bishop or saint, who was not in the Breviary. To this I answer that he will find it in page 574 of the second volume.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN—The day of the month?

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR—That I cannot give; he cannot expect me to bring a large work in four volumes about the country; I have not taken down the date, but I have noted the page and the volume; and I have seen the extract myself, and he knows it is there.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN—I do not; I am sure it is *not* there.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR—Well, I will read an extract from it, that the reverend gentleman may recognise it.—“ Emygidius born at Treves, baptized one thousand and sixty-three persons, a great supply of water having been drawn by him from a rock by a great miracle. Polimnius, driven to ~~to~~ fury by these things, cut off the head of the holy Bishop, which being done, his headless body being marvellously raised, *taking up his own head which was thrown on the ground, he carried it in his hands to the Oratory, a distance of three hundred paces!*”

And now I am sure I have edified the gentleman with what he has often read before.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN—I never read it, and never heard it before; and if you can find it in the Breviary *I will give you a hundred pounds.*

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—I hold the reverend gentleman to his promise.—He has however himself stated that the Breviary has sometimes been altered, and perhaps this is cut out of his edition; and therefore all I undertake to prove is that it is in the Breviary authorized at Rome.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—It is not. The £100 should go to build a Catholic monastery at St. Bernard.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—Oh! no; you forfeit the money, and it shall go to build a good Protestant church.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN.—To build a Catholic chapel at Guildford; it would be a great blessing to the neighbourhood.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—Well, let not the subject be changed into a jest; I resume the Breviary.

Here is another narrative; it relates to Dionysius, who is mentioned in the scriptures as the Areopagite.

“Dionysius . . . was put on a gridiron with fire under it, and together with his companions is tortured with many other punishments, but, as they all bore

their tortures with a brave and ready mind, Dionysius arrived at above his hundredth year is beheaded with the rest, of whom it is narrated that *he took up his own head after it was cut off and proceeded two miles carrying it in his hands.*"

Sir, I will not occupy the time of the meeting with more narratives of this kind. I could do it at considerable length, but it would only awaken their mirth and ridicule rather than any other feeling, and I do not desire to indulge such a tendency on an occasion like the present.

But, sir, Mr. Sidden has asked, 'Why may not these miracles be true? why should we not believe that a young lady could make a *vow of chastity* AT FIVE YEARS OLD, and that another young lady *could speak in the fifth month of her age?*'—for in this Breviary we have a story of one child, that at that age told her mother to give alms to the poor; and Mr. Sidden asks, 'Why not believe that,' (he asked,) 'as well as John the Baptist's leaping in the womb of his mother? why disbelieve miracles in the Breviary, while we believe miracles in the Bible? why not believe that two lions turned parish sextons and dug a grave for St. Paul, as is stated in another narrative, if we believe that Balaam's ass spoke?' My answer, sir, is this; I believe the miracles in the bible, *because they are in the bible and God hath written them*, and I dis-believe these legends in the Roman Breviary, because they come to me upon no such authority at all, but are the mere fabulous inventions of superstitious men and superstitious women.

'But why have we referred to the Breviary at all? Why, but because it is a book acknowledged in the church of Rome—a book which Mr. Sidden introduced to our notice in his letter to the Protestants of Guildford, in which he acknowledges he reads for an hour and a half every day—a book with which therefore he is conversant—and a book, which, teaching him day after day to contemplate these legendary

fables, prepares his mind for believing any other fiction, which the Church of Rome may please to impose on him.

With this, sir, I dismiss the Breviary.

I have occupied more of the time of the meeting than I wished; but I could not well avoid it, and there is a vast deal, which I have altogether omitted. The meeting will feel, and the reverend gentleman himself will feel, the impossibility of my entering into every detail within the limited period within which I have been confined. I mean not to apply to him in an invidious way the proverbial saying, that a child may ask a question in a day, which it will take a wise man a hundred years to answer; but it is very possible, that the gentleman may have made statements, which would occupy, in their answering, more time than this meeting could spare me or I could myself afford. His statement occupied *three hours*; I have been obliged to limit my reply to *an hour and a half*. I have attended here at the request of others; and the arrangements have not been of my making, and I may just remark that this is not the meeting which was originally proposed. After the reverend gentleman had concluded at your former meeting, he was withdrawing from the hall, and he dropped expressions to the effect that he was one that was always prepared to meet the clergy of the Church of England and discuss these questions; and with this he was retiring. I observed the use that he might make of that expression, and thought it possible he might leave the meeting, and afterwards state that he had thrown down a challenge to us to controversial discussion, and that we had feared to accept it. I therefore immediately addressed the reverend gentleman, and I asked him, in distinct terms, whether it was his intention to convey to us, that he meant to propose a public discussion of the differences between the Church of England and the Church of Rome; the gentleman hesitated for

a moment, a few words further passed between us, and at last he said, "On this subject I am in the hands of the meeting." I rejoined that the shortest way was to let the Chairman put the question—Shall we have such a discussion as to the particular points in controversy between England and Rome? The Chairman put the question; and it was carried by acclamation, that we should have such a discussion. On my returning to town (after retiring to the country,) with the intention of opening a communication with Mr. Sidden, I found that he had already been communicated with, and asked to name the subject which he meant to propose. Sir, I was prepared to ask him to name some article of the Church of England, which he would oppose and which I would defend, and then I would have named an article of the Church of Rome for me to oppose and for him to defend; but the gentleman passes off from this. He states that he did not think even the presence of Mr. Seymour or Mr. Page at all necessary for his purpose, and that, for his part, he was only anxious to propose preliminaries for a kind of peace, which was never mentioned before. Well, for this we have come; and now has he done any thing towards it? has he made one proposition towards peace. Sir, I will make a proposition of peace now; and I am sure there is not an English mind, which will not acknowledge its fairness. Every one knows that the truest method of settling differences is this—Let us go hand in hand on what we agree in, and let that in which we differ be flung to the winds. This is the principle, which should be the foundation of our peace. Now let him and let me agree to teach from henceforth even for ever only that in which we agree; and let him bind himself no more to teach the points wherein we differ. This principle being admitted, we stand in the following position. We are agreed in the Apostles' Creed, we are agreed in the Nicene Creed, we are agreed in the Athanasian

Creed; let us all teach these. They contain the articles of faith in which we are agreed. But we are not agreed in Pope Pius's Creed—that new creed of the Church of Rome—and let us fling it to the winds; let us fling to the winds all that is peculiar in this new creed; and then the reverend gentleman will have abandoned his popery.

Sir, any proposition for peace in religion deserves a christian's welcome; peace is beautiful, peace is lovely; but there must be purity before there can be peace. We must have no peace with error; we must have no peace with priestcraft; we must have no peace with superstition; we must have no peace with sacerdotal despotism. We must go forth and be at peace with each other, and at peace with God. To every member of the Church of Rome I pray *Peace!* Peace be upon them, and upon us, and upon the whole Israel of God! I pray peace upon one, I pray peace upon all. But while I have a nerve in this arm to raise it, while I have a voice in my tongue to speak it, while I have a throb in my heart to feel it, and while there is life in my veins, I shall say—Peace with all men, but no peace with Rome! peace with every Roman Catholic, but no peace with the Church of Rome! peace with all truth, but no peace with any error! Let us have this peace. Let the reverend gentleman lay aside those peculiarities of his church, which he teaches, and teach as we do; let him lay aside his foreign allegiance to a bishop at Rome, who is his diocesan, and let him submit himself (as he ought) to the bishop of this diocese of Winchester; let every clergyman in every diocese submit to his own bishop, and not to a bishop in Rome, an Italian bishop who ought not to have (and I trust never shall have) any authority in this realm. This is the peace for which I sigh; but *Delenda Roma* is written on my very heart. As Mary, of “bloody” memory, declared, that, when she died, she should have the word *Calais* written

upon her heart, so, I believe, when I pillow my head in the silent tomb, they will find written upon mine—**DELEND A ROMA ! NO PEACE WITH ROME !**

REV. JAMES R. PAGE.—I trust, sir, that you will give me your attention for about five minutes. I am very unwilling to trespass on your patience at this hour of the day; but I cannot allow this assembly to go away, without saying a few words, if you will permit me. I am the more anxious to do so as I had the privilege of taking part in the late proceedings of this Association.

Although my reverend friend has occupied you, necessarily, at some length, and most ably treated his question, you will yourselves perceive that there is still much matter left untouched. It is not my intention to enter at all upon it; but I desire, before we part with Mr. Sidden, to put the question in its true light, and then appeal to you as to the answer which you are prepared to give that reverend gentleman this day.

You have been told by my reverend friend, as also by our Chairman, how it came to pass that Mr. Sidden, instead of choosing some points of controversy between his Church and the Church of England, selected that vague topic—“*Peace among christians.*” When I heard of this, I said—“It is quite evident that the gentleman will not take up a question of controversy, and now it is for us to decide whether we should compel him to do so (as indeed he was bound to do,) or whether we shall allow him to treat *de omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis*, or, in plain English, of all things and other things besides; if we insist upon his naming a particular question, he will in all probability fly off and say that we are shrinking from the discussion; so (said I) let us give him full play, and, as he will not give any other than this vague question of *Peace among christians*, let us be satisfied.”

Now, sir, what brings Mr. Sidden here, if his object be *Peace among christians*? Did I not ask him at the last meeting to produce his credentials, and show me from holy writ, that he, ordained in another diocese, is authorised to come into this, and perplex the minds of the faithful in Christ Jesus? Did I not ask him his right to come in and interfere with a Church, which holds all the truth that was delivered by Christ, and about which there never was any dispute in the Church? But, sir, what is his "Peace?" I will tell you; his peace is this:—

He would replace the Bishop of Rome on that commanding eminence on which he once stood, but on which he stands no longer, and arm him with his former power to oppress this our emancipated land. One of his own bishops, Gregory the First, denounced in no measured terms the claim of any christian bishop to this supremacy. "I confidently affirm" (said Gregory) "that whosoever calls himself, or desires to be called, universal bishop, in his pride, is the forerunner of antichrist, because by his haughty carriage he sets himself above the rest." And yet we have now before us a reverend gentleman from the court of Rome, the friend of peace among christians, who modestly proposes that you should bow your necks under the yoke of that usurped authority, which has broken the peace of the christian church, and invaded the peace and prosperity of the world!

But mark! Mr. Sidden goes a step further; and not content with the doctrines of Christ, not content with the creeds which the church of Christ received, and in which there is no mention of all those strange specimens of christianity enumerated in the new articles drawn up by Pope Pius IV in 1564, he makes and forces his novelties upon you. He has quoted largely from the Council of Trent. Now the Council of Trent does not propose these things to you as mere matters of indifference, as from the speech of the reverend gentleman you might suppose; the Council of Trent

does not give you permission to receive or reject these things. I shall not enter into the quibble which Mr. Sidden makes, respecting those who have not had opportunities. The Council of Trent makes but this allowance—*Heresy and idolatry, or excommunication and damnation.*

The gentleman and his Church are quite too soft and too tender-hearted *now* to propose such doctrine as this; but mark what the Trent Fathers say. They mention all their awful heresies and add—"We will believe, we will confess this faith, and we will always preserve these decrees;" the response of the fathers is "We will always confess, we will always preserve them." "This," says the Council of Trent, "this is the faith of the fathers, this is the faith of the orthodox." Then with respect to heretics, who deny it—"Anathema to all heretics;" and the kind response of the fathers is—"Anathema, anathema."

And who are the "heretics?" The Rhemish testament brings this before you, and not only shows you that the Romanists impose their horrible faith upon us under pain of everlasting damnation, but likewise shows you the means by which they have endeavoured to enforce that religion, and to spread it throughout the world. That Rhemish testament will tell you, that Protestants are "thieves and murderers;" it tells you so in a note on the tenth of St. John. On that passage of St. Jude which speaks of Cain, it tells you that we are followers of Cain. On the nineteenth chapter of the Acts, it tells you to burn all our books. It tells you, in another place, (lest you should think these may be heretics in some other world,) that they are the heretics in *England*, and that God has quite taken his Church from you.

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN—But *you* are not heretics, I hope; I hope there is not one heretic in the room. You may be venially or even innocently mistaken.

REV. JAMES R. PAGE—I say, that the gentleman's Church proclaims us heretics, *us of the Church of Eng-*

land—or of the kingdom of England, for they do not allow that *we* have a Christian Church at all. In the note on Matt. xv. 9, we are assured that all our “laws, doctrines, service, and injunctions, however pretended to be consonant to the scriptures, be commandments of men; because both the things prescribed by us are impious, and the authors have neither sending nor commission from God.” And in their note on Rev. ii. 5, we are further assured—“that Christ hath taken away our golden candlestick, that is, our church in England.” So that we poor heretics have neither faith nor church amongst us!!

And now as to the way in which we, as heretics, should be treated. Mr. Sidden’s church informs us, that we no more belong to the church than deserters to an army which they have deserted. “Nevertheless it is not to be denied, but that they are within the power of the church, as those who may by it be called to judgment, punished and condemned by anathema.” So speaks the Catechism of the Council of Trent. And what this punishment is, Mr. Seymour has already shewn you from their notes on Luke ix. 55. and Rev. xviii. 6, in which “neither the Church nor Christian Princes are to be blamed for putting heretics to death—and their blood is not the blood of saints, no more than the blood of thieves, man-killers, &c. &c.”

But in the note on Rev. ii. 20, we have this wholesale destruction of heretics:—“He warneth Bishops to be zealous and stout against the false prophets of what sort soever, by alluding covertly to the example of holy Elias, that in zeal killed four hundred and fifty false prophets of Baal.”

And lest you should think that it was murder, or any such thing, (as simple minds would imagine,) to slay people by wholesale, they tell you in a passage which Mr. Seymour has read, that our blood “is not the blood of saints, any more than the blood of thieves, man-killers, and other malefactors, for the shedding of

which by order of justice no commonwealth shall answer.”

So that we have first Mr. Sidden's assumption of Papal supremacy; that is one inroad on the peace of the church. And we have, secondly, his forcing new articles of faith on men, under pain of damnation; that is the second step. And, sir, there is a third; and it is the spreading this religion by fire and sword, by the wheel and the faggot, and bringing it to pass, that, while blood has stained their sceptre, martyrs have gone to surround the throne of the Lamb.

I would now observe (although the hour forbids me to do more than to give the mere heads of what I should be glad to speak), that the nature of the religion of the Council of Trent and of the new articles of Pius the Fourth's Creed is such, that they bury the Lord Jesus Christ, so that it is not possible for an enquiring sinner to find out “where they have laid him.” They overwhelm him with their errors, their superstitions and their idolatry.—They make void his declarations of salvation through himself alone. They set him aside, they dethrone him and for a mortal like ourselves !

And is it “peace” to set aside the Prince of peace, and to dethrone the Lord of life and glory?

And, sir, the authority by which they do these things, that is, their pretended infallibility, cannot be established, (as I could show, did time permit,) on any other foundation than the ruins of the Redeemer's kingdom!

In conclusion allow me to add, that I was surprised and somewhat disgusted, that with these facts—the nature of Mr. Sidden's schism and creed, and the means by which his church has ever enforced his new religion on the world—that, I say, with these facts staring him in the face, Mr. Sidden should come here among you, christians of England, and talk of “peace.”

Oh! well might you reply—

“ They make a solitude and call it peace.”

But I now demand, and I claim your special attention—What has Mr. Sidden said to impugn the religion which we profess? I appeal to every one of you, my christian friends—(and I am proud to make the appeal)—what one article of your holy faith, what one book of your holy scriptures, has he assailed? Has he even attempted to prove, that any one article of the faith which you profess is an impediment to peace? Has he attempted to shew, that the faith which you believe is not the faith delivered by the Prince of peace himself, and about which there never was any controversy in the Christian Church? Nay verily he has not, because he knows well, that he could not! What then has the rev. gentleman been doing, or attempting, during the three hours and ten minutes he occupied your time? He has been endeavouring to gloss over the grossest errors, to varnish the most awful idolatries, and to christianize the worst possible heresies; and he has then invited you to embrace these things, giving you ample promise, that, however hideous and revolting they may appear, they are not so bad, and cannot form any “impediment to peace!!”

But, sir, since the rev. gentleman has come here with his new religion and his Trent articles—since he has come here with his Pope’s supremacy, and invited you back to the tender embrace of Rome—he expects, and ought to have his answer; and what answer are you prepared to give? Are you prepared to give up the faith of Jesus Christ? the faith that He is “the way, the truth and the life”—and that by Him and Him alone men come to the Father? are you prepared to give up this faith for the great blessings of monkery and Papal supremacy, and saints’ merits and worship, and image worship, and transubstantiation, and purgatory, and masses, and all those abominable vanities which he has been trying to gloss over and render acceptable to English ears? I trust—I know—that you

will rather say, We will adhere to the faith of our forefathers, the faith once delivered to the saints; and we tell you, the Rev. Joseph Sidden, that, if you come amongst us to claim the rites of hospitality, we are willing to extend them—if you are hungry, we are willing to feed you—if you are thirsty, to give you drink—but if you come here to seduce us from our allegiance to our Sovereign and our allegiance to our God, we tell you, that we will not for your lying vanities abandon the faith, to reveal which the Son of God came down from heaven, and for which our noble army of martyrs suffered and died—and we

—— “from the mouth of England,
 “Add thus much more—that no Italian priest
 Shall tithe or toll in these dominions take.”

The meeting having ~~now~~ lasted five hours, most of the persons present, on the conclusion of Mr. Page's address, rose to depart;—

REV. JOSEPH SIDDEN (after speaking for a moment to the Chairman,)—The Chairman tells me I may speak one sentence. I come here to teach nothing whatever, excepting that which is proved by the same reasons, as is the doctrine of one God in three Persons; I come to teach that which rests on the same authority as *that* doctrine.

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR.—Indeed, you do not.

A vote of thanks to the Chairman was then carried, acknowledged by him, and the proceedings terminated.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



44



888



926

BX

1779

1533

.G9

Guilford Protestant
Association 1838
discussion

Q-1-

3502